DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sense, Understanding and Language

A Genealogy of Sense in the Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze 1953-1969

McDonald, Andrew

Award date:
2015

Sense, Understanding and Language: A Genealogy of Sense in the Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze 1953-1969

Andrew McDonald, MA (Hons.), Mlitt

Thesis Submitted to the University of Dundee for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2015

Primary Supervisor James Williams

Secondary Supervisor Todd Mei

Abstract

This thesis analyses the concept of sense in Deleuze's early philosophy. I claim sense is an empirical process of understanding before a settled meaning has been attained. My analysis of Deleuze's early works *Nietzsche and Philosophy* and *Proust and Signs* draws upon the empirical and rationalist tension between sense and meaning. For empiricists, in order to attain meaning, we must first make sense of the world and thereby associate experiential qualities to our ideas. They argue that without this process our ideas remain blank. In contrast, for rationalists, meaning is attained through rational reflection. This enables us to attain clarity in our understanding and achieve consensus. Without this process of rational reflection, our ideas remain chaotic, based upon a multiplicity of different perspectives. We are then presented with an either/or choice. Either we must accept the necessity of making sense and face the problems of conflict of interest. Or, by adhering to deductive reasoning, individuals can arrive at clarity but face the problem of blank ideas.

Deleuze confronts the empirical and rationalist tension through the concept of sense and its relation to an apprenticeship. This joins Deleuze's work on *Nietzsche* and *Proust* to *Logic of Sense*. It is through his analysis of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass* that an alternative answer is given. For Deleuze, we must make sense

of the world but, at the same time, enable our understanding to be guided through a structure and methodology. That is to say, different methodologies and structures enable us to attain knowledge and educate others. What Deleuze makes us attentive to is a process of an experimental apprenticeship where methodological structures are continually challenged and made sense of. By practically applying structures, we attain meaning. Yet this meaning is novel because its sense follows from novel apprenticeship and experimentation. Following this. I claim that Deleuze does not seek either a purely rationalist or empirical approach, but rather, one that affirms both positions. This enables us to affirm the necessity of the process of making sense and of the novel attainment of meaning. This also enables an epistemological depth to be uncovered in early Deleuze through an analysis of his early works as studies of sense. My analysis of sense and language then develops the importance of epistemology and language in the philosophy of Deleuze, which at present remains still new and embryonic.

Table of Contents

4. IMMANENCE AND A LEIBNIZIAN APPRENTICESHIP TO SIGNS

5. LOGIC OF SENSE AND PLATO: TOWARDS A PURE METAPHYSICAL FOUNDATION FOR MEANING

6. LOGIC OF SENSE AND LEWIS CARROLL: CHALLENGING THE PURE FOUNDATION OF MEANING BY REDISCOVERING SENSE

CONCLUSION

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all those that have supported me. The continued support and advice of my supervisor James Williams. Also for the advice given me to over the years by current and previous staff members of the philosophy department at the University of Dundee, Rachel Jones, Nicholas Davey, Roger Young, Dominic Smith, Todd Mei, and Ashley Woodward. I was forever grateful for the financial assistance provided by Student Funding at the University of Dundee that was the only funding that I received throughout. It enabled me to get through some very tough times. I am grateful for the continued support and encouragement given by my father David McDonald and mother Yvonne McDonald. Lastly, it would not have been possible without the continued love and support of my partner, Lucy Jackson.

Declaration

I declare that I, Andrew McDonald, am the sole author of this thesis and it has not been accepted previously for a higher degree.

Signed

For Regina, Jagger and their future selves. Thank you for the chaos and to your grown up selves have this serve as a reminder to never forget about the importance of our child-like experience.

Introduction

What is sense?

When curiosity strikes and we seek to know, there are immediate answers waiting for us. In contemporary society, curiosity can be resolved within a few seconds after we look up a specific dictionary definition or a website entry in an encyclopedia. With this fast rate of accessible information, knowledge has become comparable to fast food. It appears that it is no longer required for an individual to read full-length studies or spend years on a given subject area. If we want to know the philosophical concepts corresponding to Descartes' cogito, Nietzsche's eternal return, or Plato's theory of Ideal Forms we only need to look up a definition. It is, of course, not just philosopher's concepts that can be easily digested. Everything in society has a ready-made meaning. Following this, we could say everything has been predefined and all that is required of us is to learn definitions. After that we can relax, put the kettle on and be content with what we have learned.

The problem with this view is that we never arrive at an understanding of things for ourselves. In other words, meaning is defined according to another's view. The meaning of a word for us remains blank. We have not gone through any process of learning, just simply typed in a definition. Without undergoing a process of education there is no clear understanding of things. By undergoing a process of learning, we can call into the question that we were content to believe was simply correct. It is thereby through learning that our critical thinking develops. We are not led into blind obedience of a view but enabled to think for ourselves. This is not to

claim that by criticising a view we can reaffirm our subjective views. To develop critical thinking is to call into question the validity of a set of beliefs and the social and cultural context in which these beliefs were adopted.

This can be related to Deleuze's critical remarks on advertising: "… information, technology, communications and advertising are taking over the words 'concept' and 'creative', and these 'conceptualists' constitute an arrogant breed that reveals the activity of selling to be capitalism's supreme thought, the *cogito* of the marketplace."[1] In advertising concepts are used in order for people to associate the universal qualities of a society and culture with the product that is on sale. For instance, this can be seen in Coca Cola's use of advertising in Poland as Jeffrey K. Johnson states: "since its earliest days, Coca-Cola has utilized copious amounts of advertising … Billboards, neon signs, supermarket displays, restaurant signs and market nameplates are only a few forms of Coca-Cola advertising signage that have become so common internationally that they are rarely considered."[2] Unlike other companies that associate a specific image with their product such as "… McDonald's, Levi's and Frito-Lay, which want their products to be considered as special purchases by the consumer, Coca-Cola does not wish to hold a vaunted position in the buyer's mind. Coca-Cola does not desire to be associated with a night on the town or become the symbol of youthful rebellion; rather, the soft-drink maker wants its products to be a common yet essential part of everyday life."[3]

[1] Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations*, trans. by Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995) p.136
[2] Jeffrey K. Johnson, *American Advertising in Poland: A Study of Cultural Interactions Since 1990* (North Carolina: McFarland and Company Inc., 2009) p.149
[3] Ibid, pp.149-150

For Deleuze, an individual must arrive at his or her own meaning for the things they encounter. In order for us to attain meaning we must undertake an apprenticeship. In its traditional sense, an apprenticeship is to undertake education according to a specific methodology. In this way, meaning is already given and is to be repeated. For instance, a trainee cook will repeat the preparation and cooking of a meal to the satisfaction of their teacher. Deleuze's apprenticeship also affirms these various educational methodologies. However, Deleuze's apprenticeship focuses on the importance of the student's education. In other words, an apprentice does not simply repeat a meaning but rather has to discover what it means. This is in order for meaning to be slowly constructed as we begin to understand things. For Deleuze this beginning of understanding requires learning a new sense for something. This use of sense is itself different to our usual understanding of the term. *To make sense is a process that is to be considered separately from understanding. It is that moment in the process of learning before we truly know what a thing means. In philosophical terms, sense is the process of understanding before the attainment of meaning.* Deleuze's apprenticeship therefore affirms the process of apprenticeship not as simply a repetition of meaning but where meaning is slowly attained through the process of education.

Deleuze's early work on epistemology and language

It is the aim of this thesis to develop Deleuze's concept of sense and its relation to language for the period 1953-1969. The period of 1953-1969 has been chosen in order to understand the role and function of the concept of sense and apprenticeship in Deleuze's early works *Nietzsche and Philosophy* and *Proust and Signs.* This enables a foundation for understanding the emergence of Deleuze's later work *Logic*

of Sense (1969) and the importance of the role of sense and apprenticeship in his philosophy. Before his *Logic of Sense*, the discussion of sense and language is limited. In *Empiricism and Subjectivity* (1953) there is a short remark made on the role of language and its relation to belief: "Illegitimate beliefs or repetitions which are not based upon experience, as well as nonphilosophical probabilities, have two sources: language and the fancy. *These are fictitious causalities*. Language, by itself, produces belief, as it substitutes observed repetition with spoken repetition, and the impression of a present object with the hearing of a specific word which allows to conceive ideas vividly."[4] In relation to experiential objects and names, we can perceive a certain object when a name is stated.

For instance, the statement 'that is a dog' refers to an actual four-legged canine that can be perceived. However, philosophy produces concepts that do not refer to experiential objects, but metaphysical ones: "The philosopher, having spoken continuously of faculties and occult qualities, ends up believing that these words 'have a secret meaning, which we might discover by reflection."[5] Deleuze's discussion of Hume's critique of rationalist approaches to language reveals that it is due to repetition that we come to associate a belief with the idea that a particular thing exists. This enables belief in metaphysical objects as actually existing through language: "… words produce a 'phantom of belief,' or a 'counterfeit', which renders the most severe critique of language philosophically necessary."[6] From this short passage on language and belief we then later see the importance of challenging

[4] Gilles Deleuze, *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, trans. by Constantin V. Boundas (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991) p.70
[5] Ibid
[6] Ibid

repetition of the same in Deleuze's philosophy in *Difference and Repetition* (1968). In repetition of the same, repetition is a generalising force that prevents the emergence of difference and creativity. For instance, repetition can be thought of as the overly strict teacher whose views the students must follow exactly and never deviate from.

This critical approach to the rationalist use of concepts is continued in *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962). This occurs in another set of Deleuze's brief remarks on language on Nietzsche's essay *Truths and Lies in An Extra-Moral Sense* (1873): "Language is usually judged from the standpoint of the hearer."[7] The hearer standpoint influences how we understand language as an acceptance of the speaker's view. In contrast: "Nietzsche dreams of another philology, an active philology … [which] has only one principle: a word only means something insofar as the speaker wills something by saying it; and one rule: treating speech as a real activity, placing oneself at the point of view of the speaker."[8] For Deleuze, what Nietzsche's philosophy of language makes us attentive to is not the meaning of words, but rather, the intension. How exactly is the word used? What effect does the speaker want to achieve by using these words? By focusing on the speaker's intention we become critical of it.

It is this focus on the critical analysis of speech that relates this brief remark on language to Deleuze's first discussion of sense: "We will never find the sense of something (of a human, a biological or even a physical phenomenon) if we do not

[7] Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy,* trans. by Hugh Tomlinson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006) p. 74.
[8] Ibid

know the force which appropriates the thing, which exploits it, which takes possession of it or expressed in it."[9] That is, we always need to make sense of another's individual communication. In doing so, an individual can be attentive to specific use of tonal emphasis and the force of the communication. For instance, in communicating a love for a specific author, we will place tonal emphasis upon what we admire about them in order for the intention of our friend or family member to read one of their books.

Despite at first sight appearing to be limited Deleuze's early work on epistemology and language concerns itself with how we attain meaning and an analysis of rhetorical processes of speech. This engagement with meaning and speech takes place in Deleuze's *Proust and Signs* (1st edition, 1964) in the concept of apprenticeship. A traditional understanding of apprentice is to learn a specific methodology or style in which we attain knowledge. Deleuze's concept of apprenticeship is to learn how to decipher and correctly understand signs. This is to move through a process of discussion of signs. In this way, we do not simply accept the signification but rather reveal how it functions in a social and cultural context. It is through this analysis of the function of signs and meaning in society that we are able to discover the image of thought. That is, the privileging of certain values and ideas by a society. Individuals are then expected to adhere to these social values and ideas. Deleuze's apprenticeship is also concerned with the discovery of other valuations and possible truths. This is to discover 'possible worlds', other valuations and perspectives that challenge our own preconceptions and view of the world. In

[9] Ibid, p.3

this way, an apprenticeship is dynamic allowing for our view to be continually altered through our engagement with the world and others.

Jean-Jacques Lecercle also notes this apparent absence of a discussion of language in Deleuze's early work: "Deleuze in many ways resists the linguistic turn that French and European philosophy in the 1960s and 1970s has taken, in a different but parallel form to the more famous linguistic turn taken by analytic philosophy several decades before."[10] This is why Lecercle suggests that: "if we take into account the specific contribution of Guattari to their common work, he is part of that turn."[11] By taking into account Deleuze's later work there is a clear interest in language with works on literature, signs, linguistics, style, speech, and the role of language in psychoanalysis. For instance, this can be seen in Deleuze's literary analysis of Lewis Carroll's work, especially *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*, analyzed in *Logic of Sense*, the new material added on style in the 2nd edition of *Proust and Signs* in 1972, Chapter 4 November 20, 1923: Postulates of Linguistics, Chapter 5 587 B.C.- A.D. 70: On Several Regimes of Signs in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980), and the creation of concepts in *What is Philosophy?* (1991).

Deleuze's early interest in various functions of language and meaning is returned to later in *A Thousand Plateaus* with Felix Guattari. This is evident through the discussions of the role of pragmatics, style, grammar and expression in the

[10] Jean-Jacques Lecercle, *Deleuze and Language* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002) p.2
[11] Ibid

'Postulates of Linguistics'. This can also be seen in their analysis of the various functions of a sign in 'On Several Regimes of Signs'. In relation to the attainment of meaning Deleuze and Guattari analyse the concept, order-word. This is where there is a complete denial of sense in preference to meaning: "we call order-words, not a particular category of explicit statements (for example, in the imperative), but the relation of every word or every statement to implicit presuppositions, in other words, to speech acts that are, and can only be, accomplished in the statement."[12] The order word is where meaning has already been predefined. An individual must then conform to the presupposed answer. Deleuze and Guattari use the examples of "Questions, promises, are order-words"[13] A question is an order-word since it presupposes a given answer. Promises are also order-words as we expect an individual to keep their word and conform to the expected action (I kept my promise and gave you the money back).

For instance, in relation to questions, the question what is the capital of France?, has a presupposed answer of Paris. If an incorrect answer is given, such as London or Tokyo then a student can be corrected until they arrive at the right answer. However, simply replying Paris does not mean that an individual has understood anything. They have simply conformed to expectation but failed to make sense of it for themselves. By making sense of Paris as a capital of France allows for an individual to understand its social and cultural qualities. This can also be applied to the recital of historical dates, when did the French revolution begin? 1789. The answer of the number 1789 lacks all understanding for the student. In making sense

[12] Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (London: Continuum, 2004) p.87
[13] Ibid

of the beginning of the French Revolution allows for an individual to gain deeper insight into the economic and political problems in that period.

It is through the emphasis of a presupposed meaning that Deleuze is critical of Wittgenstein in the *Alphabet* interview with Claire Parnet: "For me, it's a philosophical catastrophe. It's the very example of a 'school', it's a regression of all philosophy, a massive regression. The Wittgenstein matter is quite sad. They imposed a system of terror in which, under the pretext of doing something new, it's poverty instituted in all grandeur… There isn't a word to describe this danger, but this danger is one that recurs…"[14] For Deleuze, Wittgenstein's philosophy is dangerous because he argues we should adhere to a complete empirical view of the world. For instance, this can be seen in his early work *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (1921) that attempted to resolve all philosophical problems through a strict logical structure[15]. Deleuze describes this strict adherence as an assassination of philosophy since it denies the positive function of a problem. This is where in engagement with a problem we create concepts.

For Deleuze, philosophical concepts serve as a response to a contemporary problem. Deleuze breaks from traditional philosophy through his emphasis upon the

[14] Gilles Deleuze, 'W as in Wittgenstein', *Deleuze from A to Z*, trans. by Charles Stivale, dir. Pierre-Andre Boutang (Semiotext(e), 2011)

[15] This can be seen in Wittgenstein's statement "the correct method in philosophy … to say nothing except what can be said i.e. propositions of natural science … whenever someone wanted to say something metaphysical, to demonstrate to him that he failed to give a meaning to certain signs in his propositions." Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. Guinness (London: Routledge, 2005) p.89. Any statement that is made must be based on empirical facts. If there included a metaphysical entity to the statement then this can be corrected, as it will not be empirically true. For instance, if an individual made the following statement "I can see a pink elephant" they have failed to give a correct meaning. There is not a pink elephant that is empirically known nor can any other individual can see it so the statement is incorrect. For Wittgenstein any metaphysical concepts or nonsensical words should not be uttered at all and we should remain in silence when discussing these areas: "what we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence." Ibid. By not stating any nonsensical or metaphysical words the correctness of statements and our understanding of the world should be confined to what is empirically known.

positive function of problems since it allows for creation. This is because, traditionally, a problem is negative since it prevents the emergence of knowledge. Yet if an answer were to be completely accepted knowledge would become dogmatic since it would no longer be questioned. Deleuze's position is then two-fold to allow for a multiplicity of methods and disciplines to engage with problems and to allow for these methods and disciplines to be questioned and criticized. This enables us to challenge the validity of claims made and allows for alternative claims or views to be made.

The order-word therefore demonstrates for Deleuze the problem if we separate the fields of epistemology and language. In both cases, on a philosophical level, meaning has become transcendent. Language becomes a blank word. It represents a blank space that is void of all experiential qualities. Language is then condemned to express an ideality by never being able to express actual things in the world. Comparably, knowledge is dogmatic if confined to a purely empirical view. Thereby denying the philosophical process of challenging presupposed answers. In this way, scientific truth becomes transcendent by assuming a particular view will always be correct.

The reconstruction of Deleuze's philosophy by academics

In contrast to the transcendent metaphysics implied by order-words, Deleuze's philosophy argues for immanence. That is, the attainment of truth is inseparable from the worldly forces and processes that created it. Deleuze's most notable declaration of a philosophy of immanence is made in a brief article entitled *Immanence: A Life* (1995) near the end of his life. However, this emphasis on immanence has left his

philosophy to be defined in various ways by contemporary academics. This is because immanence affirms the dual role of empiricism and rationalism. Empiricism is affirmed through the necessity of the role of our experiential world. At the same time, a rationalist emphasis upon understanding the transcendent structure of the world is also affirmed. For instance, this dichotomy can be identified in Spinoza's famous philosophy of immanence that argued God and nature are one and the same substance in *The Ethics* (1677). As we shall see, most academics achieve a clear definition of Deleuze's philosophy through the interpretation of his statement in *What is Philosophy*? that the aim of philosophy is the creation of concepts. It is through the emphasis upon creation that has enabled various academics to determine the role of structure and value in Deleuze's philosophy. A brief analysis of Peter Hallward, Manuel DeLanda, Alain Badiou and Anne Sauvagnargues' views will now be made in order to demonstrate the diversity of the contemporary interpretation of Deleuze.

A philosophy of pure becoming

Peter Hallward in *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation* (2006) argues that Deleuze's philosophy affirms becoming or a continual state of transformation. This is due to Deleuze's emphasis on creativity: "Deleuze presumes that being is creativity. Creativity is what there is and it creates all that there can be … Every biological or social configuration is a creation, and so is every sensation, statement or concept."[16] That is, everything in the world has been created. For instance, we could seek an inventor for any of our everyday objects, Otto Frederick Rohwedder invented a bread-slicing machine in 1928, or John Logie Baird invented the technique in 1925 to show moving images on a television. However, for

[16] Peter Hallward, *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation* (London: Verso, 2006) p.1

Hallward, Deleuze's philosophy is not concerned with the end result but the process of creating: "in each case, the activity in question is precisely … a dynamic activity or process, rather than the created: a writing rather than the written, an expression rather than the expressed, a conceiving rather than the conceived."[17] This is because in order to be truly creative or created completely new things there must be an abstraction from already existing objects: "Deleuze's philosophy is best described as an exercise in creative *indiscernment*, an effort to subtract the dynamics of creation from the mediation of the created."[18] Due to this, Hallward argues that Deleuze is a purely metaphysical thinker: … preoccupied with the mechanics of *dis*-embodiment and *de*-materialisation."[19] Deleuze's philosophy therefore does not allow us to gain a deeper understanding of the world since it takes place on a complete metaphysical plane: "Deleuze's philosophy is oriented by lines of flight that lead out of the world; though not other-worldly, it is *extra*-worldly."[20]

A realist philosophy compatible with science

Manuel DeLanda's Deleuze in *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (2002) affirms a realist ontology. A realist philosophy is: "… philosophers who grant reality full autonomy from the human mind, disregarding the difference between the observable and the unobservable, and the anthropocentrism this distinction implies."[21] In this way, a realist philosophy is fully compatible with a scientific approach. This is because everything in the world can be explained by their scientific properties (chemical, biological or its physics). However, for DeLanda, Deleuze

[17] Ibid
[18] Ibid, p.3
[19] Ibid
[20] Ibid
[21] Manuel DeLanda, *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2002) p.2

rejects the realist view that everything in the world can be reduced to: "… an *essence*, a core set of properties that defines what these objects are."[22] By defining properties according to an essence affirms transcendent properties. That is, unchanging qualities that will always remain the same over time. From DeLanda's reading of Deleuze it is not transcendent qualities but rather dynamic processes which define objects and preserve their identity: "something else is needed to explain what gives objects their identity and what preserves their identity through time."[23] By defining objects according to dynamic processes means that even the metaphysical processes: "… remain immanent to the world of matter and energy."[24] An immanent metaphysics then remain inseparable from our understanding of the world and is not completely detached from it, which is a consequence of a transcendent view. Deleuze's philosophy therefore: "breaks with the essentialism that characterizes naïve realism and … removes one of the main objections which non-realists make … [through its explanation of] how the entities that populate reality are produced without the need for anything transcendent."[25]

A pseudo-rationalist philosophy of Oneness

In contrast to Hallward's image of a philosophy of pure becoming, Alain Badiou in *Deleuze: The Clamour of Being* (1997) argues that: "Deleuze's fundamental problem is most certainly not to liberate the multiple but to submit thinking to a renewed concept of the One."[26] Deleuze's philosophy of Oneness is identified through: "…

[22] Ibid, p.3
[23] Ibid
[24] Ibid
[25] Ibid
[26] Alain Badiou, *Deleuze: The Clamor of Being* trans. by Louise Burchill (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000) p.10

indicating particular *cases of a concept*."[27] This process of identifying concepts is where Deleuze: "… in starting from innumerable and seemingly disparate cases … arrives at conceptual productions that I would unhesitatingly qualify as monotonous, composing a very particular regime of emphasis or almost infinite repetition of a limited repertoire of concepts, as well as a virtuosic variation of names, under which what is thought remains essentially identical."[28] To illustrate this point, Badiou gives an example of the emergence of Deleuze's concepts in his two books on cinema, *Cinema 1: The Movement Image* (1983) and *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (1985): "Consider the example of cinema. On the one hand, Deleuze singularly analyzes work after work, with the disconcerting erudition of a nonspecialist. Yet, on the other hand, what finally comes out of this is siphoned into the reservoir of concepts that, from the very beginning of his work, Deleuze has established and linked together: namely, movement and time ..."[29] Deleuze begins an apprenticeship to cinema having no prior knowledge. In entering this apprenticeship he engaging in discussions of several different films, actors, directors and so forth. For Badiou, the aim of all of these discussions is to discover the general Idea that is expressed throughout various works. In other words, this is to express an image of thought or transcendent signification that is revealed throughout the works. In relation to Deleuze's works on cinema this is expressed in the concepts of movement and time throughout various uses of an image in film. Therefore Oneness is always expressed through the same concepts despite Deleuze's different analyses and use of terms.

[27] Ibid, p.13
[28] Ibid, p.15
[29] Ibid

A transcendental empiricist, post-Kantian philosophy

Anne Sauvagnargues' *Deleuze: L'empirisme transcendantal* (2009) states:

> Deleuze continues the Kantian undertaking of a critique of thought and gives it the task of inspecting its own chronic weaknesses, the transcendental illusion he calls the image of thought. Transcendental empiricism is a clinic of thought that seeks to guarantee an empiricism purged of transcendental illusions by showing the operating modes of thought that explain its inventiveness but also its conformism.[30]

Deleuze renews the Kantian project of critique through a critical analysis of philosophical concepts. The analysis of philosophical concepts provides us with an image of their thought, enabling us to understand their perspective. It is through the analysis of philosophical concepts that we can take into account their inventiveness and their social and cultural impact. At the same time, the purity of transcendental categories or conditions for knowledge is challenged. This purity is challenged by demonstrating that they are conditioned by their social and cultural context. Sauvagnargues illustrates that, in contrast to DeLanda's view, Deleuze cannot be limited to a realist view that analyses dynamic processes. This is because Deleuze's philosophy retains the transcendental aspect of Kantian philosophy. In other words, it enables an analysis of the conditions in which creation takes place: "Transcendental, yet, empirical, it rejects the Kantian dichotomy between the empirical and the *a priori*.

[30] Anne Sauvagnargues, Deleuze: *L'empirisme transcendantal* (Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 2009) p.9. The original French passage is as follows: Deleuze reprend l'initiative kantienne d'une critique de la pensee, et lui assigne a sou tour le role d'inspecter ses zones de faiblesses chroniques, cette illusion transcendantale qu'il nomme l'image de la pensee. L'empirisme transcendantal consiste en une clinique de la pensee, qui cherche a garantir un empirisme purge des illusions de la transcendance, en exposant les modes operatoires de la pensee, qui rendent compte de son inventivite mais aussi de son conformisme.

Still, it remains transcendental since it retains intensity as the insensible limit of difference itself … [transcendental empiricism] is precisely this intensive world of differences, where qualities find their rationale and the sensible finds its being."[31]

Deleuze does not seek to reconcile the problems of rationalism and empiricism, but rather, overcomes them. These problems of knowledge are overcome through an analysis of their transcendental conditions. That is, Deleuze is concerned with the underlying conditions that enable the creation of concepts. It is through these intensive conditions that reveal the limit to difference. For Sauvagnargues, difference is not a continual state of becoming since intensive conditions in which the concept is created provide a limit. An analysis of these worldly processes reveals difference as transcendental and pushes thought towards transcendental difference. This demonstrates Deleuze's philosophy is transcendental since it reveals the conditions of thought. At the same time it is empirical since transcendental conditions are dependent upon the worldly context. As this worldly context changes over time different transcendental conditions will take place according to these conditions. Therefore in contrast to Kant's transcendental categories, Deleuze's transcendental conditions are dynamic and defined according to worldly forces.

A philosophy of discovering paradoxes as the creation of structures

In contrast to these views, my thesis argues that Deleuze does not take either a rationalist or empirical position. Nor does he seek to overcome the problems of both

[31] Anne Sauvagnargues 'Hegel and Deleuze: Difference or Contradiction' Trans. By Marc Champagne, Niels Feuerhahn and Jim Vernon in Karen Houlie and Jim Vernon (eds.) *Hegel and Deleuze: Together Again for the First Time*, (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2013) p.52

positions. My position is that Deleuze's philosophy affirms the paradox of their dichotomy. This paradox is to adopt an empirical position of importance of the world and its processes in forming our ideas. At the same time, this is also to adopt a rationalist position by affirming structures that serve to educate us and form a basis for our knowledge. A reason for this paradoxical dichotomy within Deleuze's philosophy is because he is concerned with revealing problems or paradoxes within philosophies, rather than seeking to resolve or reconcile them. This view raises a criticism, namely, it is the matter of philosophy to resolve paradoxes. Philosophical reflection enables us to reveal paradoxes and then recommend a solution to them. An answer to this criticism is that Deleuze's philosophy is not against answers but precisely analyzes philosophical concepts in order to allow deeper questions to be asked, for example: Why was it necessary to create this specific concept? What problem does the concept respond to? What worldly influences (social, cultural, historical, political) can be identified?

From this we can see that the philosophic task of the creation of concepts is on the surface a radical critique of structures. However, on a deeper philosophic level it demonstrates how paradoxes and problems create structure: "… in philosophy there are two things at once: the creation of a concept, and the creation of a concept always occurs as a function of a problem. If one has not found the problem, one cannot understand philosophy, philosophy remains abstract."[32] Without being able to identify which problem the concept responds to a philosophy may appear to be metaphysical and abstract. For instance, Leibniz's monads are

[32] Gilles Deleuze, 'H as in the History of Philosophy', *Deleuze from A to Z DVD*, trans. by Charles Stivale (Semiotext(e), 2011)

indivisible and have no parts. Due to this, Leibniz's philosophy appears to be strange and hard to understand since we cannot seem to relate it to anything in the world. As Brandon Look remarks "Leibniz's metaphysics is strange – or so it appears at first … And it is still the case that when students first encounter Leibniz's philosophy they adopt an incredulous stare."[33] Anthony Savile also comments "A common reaction to [Leibniz's] metaphysic[s] is to dismiss it as an extravagant fairy tale, one that is not seriously concerned with the reality around us at all."[34]

For Deleuze, we can arrive at a concrete understanding of Leibniz's concepts by taking into account the social and cultural context in which the concepts were created. As Tom Conley in his preface to Deleuze's *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* states "… Leibniz's theories are not specifically 'objects' but, in Deleuze's lexicon, Baroque *territories*."[35] Niamh McDonnell and Sjoerd van Tuinen also comment on Deleuze's emphasis on the Baroque context: "… the subtitle [of Deleuze's *The Fold*] asks that we read Leibniz's philosophy in between seventeenth century art and science and in doing so the 'operative function' [of creating folds] is put into play."[36] The creation of monads, is therefore a reaction by Leibniz to the problem of the inability to clearly distinguish things in the world. This inability to clearly distinguish is described by Deleuze: "[Leibniz] didn't create the 'monad' for the pleasure of it … he saw the world as an aggregate of things folded within each other … [following this,] you can never reach something that is completely

[33] Brandon Look (ed.), *The Continuum Companion to Leibniz* (London: Continuum, 2011) p.89
[34] Anthony Savile, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Leibniz and the Monadology* (London: Routledge, 2000) p.26
[35] Tom Conley, 'Translator's foreword: A plea for Leibniz' in Gilles Deleuze, *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, trans. by Tom Conley (London: Continuum, 2006) p. xviii
[36] Niamh McDonnell and Sjoerd van Tuinen (eds.), *Deleuze and the Fold: A Critical Reader* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) p.4

unfolded."[37] Deleuze illustrates this through the problem of defining the soul where: "Its precisely because perceptions, feelings, ideas are folded into a soul that [Leibniz] constructed this concept of a soul [as a monad]."[38]

Therefore problematizing concepts, in contrast to seeking direct answers to questions, allow for an individual to make sense of a concept. In making sense of a concept we give a worldly empirical context to a concept. It is through this process of understanding the contemporary context that enables philosophical concepts to become concrete and worldly. This enables the relation between epistemology and language to be affirmed through the relation of worldly forces, the process of making sense and the attainment of meaning. For Deleuze, it is in philosophical thought, or the act of critically engaging with society, that we can challenge its values. In doing so, we no longer accept given meanings as true but have to make sense of things. We thereby enter into a child-like state by having to revaluate our given values. The worldly context then shapes how we reconstruct meaning.

Jeffrey A. Bell also illustrates the role of paradoxical dichotomy: "[The] contrasting interpretations of Deleuze's work do not pose a problem for Deleuze scholarship; to the contrary, they highlight Deleuze's very claim that empiricism is only correctly defined by dualism. One need not choose between the realist or nominalist Deleuze. It is more accurate to state, instead, that there is a double movement of Deleuze's thought, a nominalist and realist movement."[39] The realist aspect of Deleuze: "… provides us with the conceptual tools to name that which

[37] Gilles Deleuze, 'H as in the History of Philosophy', *Deleuze from A to Z DVD*
[38] Ibid
[39] Jeffrey A. Bell, *Deleuze's Hume: Philosophy, Culture and the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009) p.4

already is/was identifiable."[40] This realist analysis of the empirical world enables the identification of the worldly processes and forces, the problems and paradoxes that a specific philosophical concept responds to. On the other hand: "the *nominalist* Deleuze gives us the means to name the manner in which something is *not yet* identifiable but becomes so when it becomes nameable – that is, when actualized."[41] We are completely unaware of all the forces and problems that affect our thought; they remain unidentifiable. Yet an analysis of philosophical concepts is able to identify and name these forces at work that was necessary in order for a new concept to be created.

However, for Deleuze, we cannot determine thought solely by any influence be it social, cultural, political, historical, economic or environmental: "I could always say historical, social forces … but I believe in a kind of becoming of thought, [an] evolution of thought that results not only in no longer posing the same problems, but also they are no longer posed in the same way … a call for the necessity always to create and re-create new concepts. The history of philosophy cannot be reduced to sociological influence, or to another influence …"[42] This is because identifying influencing factors that determine thought places a limit upon our understanding. This would be to limit our understanding and creativity to specific epochs (Da Vinci is a classic example of Renaissance Art, Warhol of a 20th Century reaction to consumerism.) Deleuze view is that we continually make sense. In this way, Deleuze is not solely concerned with the attainment of meaning but also with how we return to it. In returning to meaning, we enter into a process of making sense again. This

[40] Ibid, p.3
[41] Ibid, p.4
[42] Gilles Deleuze, 'H as in the History of Philosophy', *Deleuze from A to Z DVD*

could be day after day, a few weeks, months or even years. In each case, the attainment of meaning is a work in progress. It is a process through which there is a continual revaluation of our own understanding. This is why a philosopher's understanding cannot be generalised nor limited to social or cultural context. This generalisation does not take into account the novelty and fragility of meaning. The novelty and fragility of meaning can be identified in the process of reading Deleuze. This is because for a reader of Deleuze his philosophy is an apprenticeship. In other words, it emphasises an individual undertaking his or her own apprenticeship. From this, Deleuze's philosophy is different from a traditional approach philosophy. It does not seek to provide answers. The answers that are provided are to be challenged. Nor does it seek to create an absolute or pure structure. It asks for the reader to revaluate them. In this way, an individual will make sense and arrive at their his or her own understanding of philosophies, whether his or her own or that of others, and the world. Deleuze's approach then differs from a relativist position since we have no immediate awareness of the worldly processes and influences that shape our understanding. An apprenticeship remains then part of a dynamic process of working with a methodology or structure and the implicit influence of contemporary influences and problems that force aspects of it to be altered. By learning we can affirm the importance of structure by enabling understanding to take place, and at the same time, we can also affirm the transformation of this structure by a student coming to their own understanding of it through its practical application.

My thesis adopts a genealogical approach in order to reveal the empirical and rationalist tension and conflicts within Deleuze's philosophy. The tensions that are discussed throughout the chapters are not to be understood in a dialectical manner

where one force will synthesise with another. On the contrary, it is through an analysis of these conflicts that enables a disjunctive synthesis to be affirmed. This is where the opposition between values is beneficiary for the production of knowledge. In other words, it is not through a continual resolution of problems but the creation and engagement with problems that enables the process of understanding to take place. From this it can be seen that the concept of genealogy is opposed to a Hegelian dialectical approach that documents the historical transformation of oppositional forces and their resolution over periods of time. A genealogical approach, on the other hand, documents the underlying immanent forces that influence the construction of an idea. A genealogical approach therefore affirms underlying immanent forces, which influence the creation of general structures of thought or causal principles, rather than, seeking to establish them. This demonstrates a transition in the concept of sense from an empiricism based upon a structural analysis of phenomena (which seeks to establish conditions for knowledge) to Deleuze's radical transformation of empiricism based upon an immanent metaphysics (that reveals those conditions as affected by worldly forces).

The initial chapter on *Nietzsche and Philosophy* analyses the first conflict between sense and transcendent values. This conflict occurs through a discussion of Friedrich Nietzsche's early essays 'On the Origin of Language' and 'On Rhetoric'. Nietzsche's later concepts of genealogy and transvaluation are discussed as an advancement of his earlier essays. The second conflict that takes place is between sense and its dialectical negation. This is illuminated through an analysis of Hegel's The *Phenomenology of Spirit* and The *Science of Logic*. Deleuze's problematizes Hegel through the dialectical method and negation in Max Stirner's *The Ego and its*

Own. After this, a contrast emerges between the Hegelian concept of negation (experiential forces are nonsensical and do not constitute knowledge) and Nietzsche's project of transvaluation of values (experiential forces underlie the construction of knowledge). Deleuze's reading then enables a positive role of sense to be affirmed and in doing so, reverses the role of negation within the dialectic.

The remaining chapters develop the relation of the concept of apprenticeship to sense. The fourth and fifth chapters develop the conflict between rationalist and empirical apprenticeships that occurs in *Proust and Signs*. The fourth develops Deleuze's critical remarks of rationalist apprenticeship. A concept of rationalist apprenticeship is defined through a reading of Descartes' *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* and *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Descartes' rationalist view is problematized through an objection made by Hobbes. These contrasting approaches to apprenticeship are reflected in a modern linguistic discussion of Noam Chomsky's *Cartesian Linguistics* and William Labov's *Sociolinguistics*. Deleuze's critical remarks on Chomsky and Labov with Felix Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* demonstrate a paradoxical relationship between meaning and communication. Or in other words, the effect worldly forces have upon language and its conveyance.

This allows for a contrast with the fifth chapter, which establishes Deleuze's concept of apprenticeship. It will be argued that the Deleuze's concept of apprenticeship emerges through a conflict between singularity and universality. This occurs in Deleuze's brief remarks on Leibniz in *Proust*. Following this, an individual's understanding is monadic, singular and completely unique. At the same time, it is argued that this singularity of our understanding is paradoxically maintained through

the use of general terms. Through the discussion of monads and possible worlds in Leibniz's *Discourse on Metaphysics* and The *Monadology* enables further insight into the functioning of an immanent apprenticeship through the affirmation of the paradox between singularity and universality.

Finally, Deleuze's *Logic of Sense* is separated into two discussions. The first deals with the paradox of becoming and universal language in Plato's *Cratylus*. This takes place through the two contrasting positions of Hermogenes and Cratylus. Hermogenes' view argues for the use of private language in order to maintain the uniqueness of each individual's perspective. Whilst Cratylus' view is that we can discover the true meaning of words by their etymological origin. Plato's position then seeks to reconcile both views overcoming the problems of communication and meaning in order for individuals to reflect upon the Idea. It is by reflecting upon the Idea that we can understand how all languages share the same meaning. The second discussion of *Logic of Sense* deals with Deleuze's reversal of Platonism. This reversal is made in Deleuze's reading of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*. It is shown that Deleuze's engagement with this paradox is reflective of the conflicts between sense and meaning established in the previous chapters. Therefore through Deleuze's engagement with this paradox allows for a formation of a framework for a philosophy of language as based on immanence and sense. The thesis concludes with a summary of the prior conflicts within the thesis and an analysis of Deleuze's self criticism of his own use of concepts in order provide the reader with insight into the development of his philosophy of language and a reason for the necessity of his radicalisation of style

that occurs in his work with Guattari.

Locke, Sense and Language

The remainder of the introduction will now allow for us to trace the foundations of Deleuze's concept of sense to a discussion of Locke's conception in his philosophy of language in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. At first this is a strange connection to be made in relation to Deleuze's philosophy due to the lack of discussion of Locke's work. Although writing on Hume, Deleuze's only discussion of Locke occurs in a brief moment to be found in Deleuze's Leibniz lecture on 24th April 1980[43]. The brief discussion of Locke relates his concept of anxiety to his uneasiness of entering into an exchange with Leibniz. Nevertheless, a relation to Locke can be made based upon his concept of sense. This is because Locke deals with the empirical conflict between sense (the process of understanding) and meaning (the attainment of comprehension). As we have seen it is this dynamic between sense and meaning that also takes precedence in Deleuze's epistemology and philosophy of language. This dynamic will then be explored in Locke's concept of sense and its relation to general and private uses of language. From this discussion of Locke, a strong connection between his concept of sense and Deleuze's later work *Logic of Sense* can be made (A full discussion of Deleuze's view of sense in *Logic of Sense* is made in chapter 6.) This is why I have chosen to discuss Locke, rather than Hume, in order to provide a basis to the concept of sense. I have also chosen to discuss Locke because Deleuze does not discuss the concept

[43] Gilles Deleuze, Leibniz course at Vincennes 29th April 1980, transcribed by Richard Pinhas, http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=54&groupe=Leibniz&langue=1 [accessed 12th January 2015]. English translation can be found here: http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=55&groupe=Leibniz&langue=2

of sense at all in his work on Hume. My analysis of Locke's concept of sense allows for an empirical foundation to be formed for Deleuze's own concept of sense. However, this is not to say that Deleuze is completely Lockean, rather, Locke's definition of sense will be challenged by its denial of unique senses and understandings by generality. Despite this, Deleuze still upholds Locke's initial claim of privileging the empirical process of making-sense as necessary for understanding. Following my discussion of Locke, Leibniz's reading of Locke's philosophy in the *New Essays on Human Understanding* will be used to problematize the concept of sense. This will be in order to draw out Leibniz's problems of the singularity of our understanding where our thought is always unique and therefore cannot be generalized.

At the beginning of Book 3 on language in his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* Locke states: "*Words in their primary or immediate signification, stand for nothing, but the Ideas in the Mind of him that uses them*."[44] Locke is here alluding to a child-like interaction with the world. Everything in the world in this child-like state is devoid of meaning. Objects are without any particular word attributed to them. They are only known through their sensual properties. Later we are told of the names that are associated to these particular objects. However, this process of naming objects is problematical. This is because it is only once we have made sense of things in the world that words are able to mean and signify particular ideas. Locke illustrates this point in the problem of communicating an idea to another individual: "When a man speaks to another, it is, that he may be understood; and the end of speech is, that those sounds, as marks, [the speaker] may make known his Ideas to

[44] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. by Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975) p.405

the Hearer."[45] The purpose of communicating is for our words to be understood. However, these words will remain blank and have no meaning until the other individual is able to attain their own understanding of it: "Till he has some Ideas of his own, he cannot suppose them to correspond with the conceptions of another man; nor can he use signs for them: for thus they would be the signs of he knows not what …"[46] This can be related to the everyday example of a friend having a film they really enjoy but we have not heard of nor seen. In communicating their love of the film to us, we have no knowledge of what the film's title, plot, or its actors. In this way, despite our friends' enjoyment for the film, we cannot gain a complete understanding of it until we have watched it for ourselves.

After we have attained our own understanding, this will be different from another individuals: "when he represents to himself other men's Ideas, by some of his own, if he gives consent to give them the same names, that other men do, 'tis still to his own Ideas; to Ideas that he has, and not to Ideas that he has not."[47] That is, the way in which each individual understands is different. When communicating a particular name to another individual, they will associate their own understanding to it. From this, it is evident that each way in which a thing is made sense of affects how a word is interpreted. Locke uses the example of a child's association of gold: "A child having taken notice of nothing the metal he hears called gold, but the bright shining yellow colour, he applies to his own Idea of that colour, and nothing else."[48] This colour is then associated to other objects such as in "… a peacocks tail." Ibid The qualities of gold can then be added to so it "… signifies a body, bright, yellow,

[45] Ibid
[46] Ibid, p.406
[47] Ibid
[48] Ibid

fusible, and very heavy."[49] Yet when adding these qualities it does not apply to the child's own simple understanding of gold as a colour: "… he [cannot] make it stand, as a sign of such a complex Idea, as he has not [come to his own understanding of its various different properties]."[50] Walter R. Ott notes that the utterance of a word is not completely meaningless since it enables us to relate a specific sound to it: "If my uttering 'gold' cannot be a reliable indicator of the sound 'gold'. The word used in this way is not strictly speaking meaningless, since it signifies an idea; the idea in question is simply that of the sound of 'gold'"[51]

As we can associate different ideas to the same word, Locke's philosophy of language maintains the use of general names. This is because general names are necessary in order to signify general Ideas: "words become general, by being made by the signs of general *Ideas*."[52] A general idea is not applicable to our variety of experiential qualities: "*Ideas* becomes general, by separating from the circumstances of Time, and Place, and any other Ideas that may determine them to this or that particular Existence."[53] This is because a general idea is a universal expression of a various experiential qualities: "By this way of abstraction they are made capable of representing more Individuals than one; each of which, having in it a conformity to that abstract Idea …"[54] Following this, a careful note must be made. Even though words refer to specific Ideas Locke is not denying our experiential relation to things in the world as Paul Guyer remarks "it is quite clear that Locke does not mean to say that our words refer *only* to our ideas rather than to things … rather, Locke is arguing

[49] Ibid
[50] Ibid
[51] Walter R. Ott, *Locke's Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) p.32
[52] John Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, p.410
[53] Ibid, p.411
[54] Ibid

that we refer to things by means of the ideas of them that we associate with our names for them."[55] Locke demonstrates this through the example of children's use of general terms. A child will associate a general name to a particular thing such as using the term of Mamma for their mother: "The Names they first give … the Names of *Nurse* and *Mamma*, the Child uses, determine themselves to those Persons."[56]

However, when a child then learns that there are many different individuals that resemble their mother and father they do not attribute the same names to these other individuals: "Afterwards, when time and a larger Acquaintance has made them observe … [that there are many different individuals] resemble their Father and Mother … they frame an *Idea*, which they find many particulars do partake in; and to that they give, with others [who are not their parents], the name Man, for Example."[57] The same name of mother and father is not given to a stranger as a child has formed an idea of qualitative differences of their parents through their associations (Mother has blonde hair whilst ladies X, Y, Z do not share the same shade of blondeness.) All other individuals then are able to be attributed a name of man, woman, or stranger since they do not share the same qualities of their parents. It is through their association of qualitative differences that a child attains a general name and general idea of their parents. A general idea contain qualitative differences and so cannot be confused with another individuals: "wherein they make nothing new, but only leave out of the complex Idea they had of *Peter* and *James*, *Mary* and *Jane*, that which is peculiar to each, and retain only what is common to all."[58] Therefore when representing their parents or carers we can be sure that children use general ideas

[55] Paul Guyer, 'Locke's philosophy of language' in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*, ed. by Vere Chappell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) p.121
[56] Ibid, p.411
[57] Ibid
[58] Ibid

to take into account the qualitative differences that enable them to denote their parents: “The Ideas of the Nurse, and the Mother, are well framed in [children’s] Minds; and, like Pictures of them, represent only those Individuals.”[59]

Another reason general names are necessary is because: “*it is impossible, that every particular Thing should have a distinct peculiar Name*.”[60] Locke here alludes to the limits of language, namely, that is impossible to have a singular name for everything in the world (One name for each leaf.) If individuals used singular names it would be in vain since they would not be able to communicate their ideas clearly to others: “… if it were possible, *it would yet be useless* … Men would in vain heap up Names of particular Things, that would not serve them to communicate their ideas.”[61] An individual would speak a singular language that is only known to themselves. As meaning is singular it would impossible for communication of ideas to occur since another individual would designate an object with a different name [I designate Y as X but they designate Y as Z]. This demonstrates the benefit of general names since they allow for communication of individual’s ideas which would be impossible if based upon singular names: “Men learn Names, and use them in Talk with others, only that they may be understood: which is then only done, when by Use or Consent, the Sound I make by the Organs of Speech, excites in another Man’s Mind, who hears it, the Idea I apply it to in mine, when I speak it. This cannot be done by Names, applied to particular Things …”[62] General names allow for communication because names apply to the same Ideas. In this way, through communicating a particular idea another individual will be able to understand what is

[59] Ibid
[60] Ibid, p.409
[61] Ibid
[62] Ibid, pp.409-10

being stated. Due to this inability to communicate they do not lead to an improvement of an individual's knowledge: "… *a distinct Name for every particular Thing would not be of any great use for the improvement of knowledge*."[63] Our understanding is not based upon solely what our minds can make sense of but dependent upon communication and interaction with other individuals. This enables Locke to be affirmative of other views where our understanding is enriched through communication. From this, we can see that Locke's view is in contrast to Descartes where our understanding is built upon what we can rationally deduce for ourselves.

However, Locke does not completely disregard the use of singular names. This is because singular names are used in a personal manner when not communication in a public sense. In other words, individuals use a private language that differs from a public language. This private language uses *proper names* which is not the general name attributed but its personal name: "… [individuals] have often occasion to mention particular Persons; they make use of proper Names, and there distinct individuals have distinct Denominations … Besides Persons, Countries also, Cities, Rivers, Mountains, and other the like Distinctions of Place, have usually found peculiar Names, and for the same Reason; they being such as Men have often an Occasion to mark particularly."[64] A common use of proper names is to attribute a nickname to a number of different particular things such as individuals, places, pets, or cities. In relation to cities, a proper name of New York City is the Big Apple. One of the theories as to why New York City attainted the nickname of the Big Apple is due to horse-racing columnist John J. FitzGerald, as Valeri R. Helterbran explains "… according to Barry Popik, a New York City slang historian, it was in 1924, thanks

[63] Ibid, p.410
[64] Ibid

to horse-racing columnist John J. FitzGerald … [when he] overheard stablehands in New Orleans using 'big apple' to refer to the goal of racing in New York. He liked the nickname and used the phrase to name his column 'Around the Big Apple' in the *New York Morning Telegraph*."[65]

It is due to its popularisation that the proper name of the Big Apple that shares its general name of New York. Locke also takes the popularisation of proper names into consideration and imagines a possible situation where a particular name for horses would be as popular as a general name for an individual: "… if we had Reason to mention particular Horses, as often as we have to mention particular Men, we should have proper Names for the one, as familiar as for the other; and [Alexander the Great's horse] *Bucephalus* would be a Word as much in use, as *Alexander*."[66] Through the popularisation of a proper name allows it to become part of a general understanding. When communicating a popular proper name it would be possible for both individuals to understand what is being stated since they adhere to the same idea.

Leibniz, Singularity and Language

Leibniz first read Locke's *Essay* in 1695 and despite a few critical remarks he found Locke's views praiseworthy, as Nicholas Jolley explains "… as was [Leibniz's] habit, he recorded his reactions in writing; he wrote a mildly critical but mainly complimentary paper which he sent to a Scottish acquaintance, Thomas Burnett, in

[65] Valeri R. Helterbran, *Why Flamingos Are Pink: ... and 250 Other Things You Should Know* (Maryland: Taylor Trade Publishing, 2007) p.212
[66] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, p.410

the hope that he would communicate it to Locke himself."[67] Locke did not receive Leibniz's letter until 1697. It was in the same year that he wrote a letter to his friend William Molyneux[68], a member of the Irish Parliament about his view of Leibniz, as Peter Alexander remarks "… In a letter to William Molyneux in that year [1697] Locke says that he has read [Leibniz's letter] and a paper by Leibniz referred to in it … Locke was clearly unfamiliar was Leibniz's central doctrines he was doubtless in no position to appreciate Leibniz's objection. [This is due to] Locke [having] read little, if anything else by Leibniz."[69] Despite his lack of knowledge of Leibniz's philosophy: "Locke's response was churlish. He refused to be drawn into correspondence with Leibniz and wrote slightingly to Molyneux about [Leibniz's] two papers."[70] This can be identified in Locke's discourteous remark: "You and I agree pretty well concerning the man; and this sort of fiddling makes me hardly avoid thinking that he is not that very great man that has been talked of him."[71]

Despite his initial attempt being unsuccessful in being able to enter into a correspondence with Locke, Leibniz made several more attempts, as Jolley states "… he made a number of attempts to enter into a correspondence with Locke … However, his efforts were unavailing. Locke had indeed received Leibniz's first

[67] Nicholas Jolley, *Leibniz* (London: Routledge, 2005) pp.23-4
[68] William Molyneux is remembered as posing an epistemic problem of blindness to Locke, as Timothy Stanton states: "Molyneux is best remembered today for proposing a problem arising out the Essay's account of the way in which diverse senses worked together to convey Ideas to the mind. Molyneux's problem was whether a blind man, his sight restored, given a globe and a cube, could by sight alone tell which was which. Locke would note the problem in the second edition of the *Essay*, agreeing with Molyneux that the blind man would be unable to do so." Timothy Stanton, 'Locke and His Influence' in *The Oxford handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century* ed. by James A. Harris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) p.26
[69] Peter Alexander, 'Solidity and Elasticity in the Seventeenth Century' in *Locke's Philosophy: Content and Context*, ed. By G. A. J. Rogers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) p.151
[70] Ibid
[71] John Locke, Essay Concerning Human Understanding, ed. A. C. Fraser Oxford, 1894, vol. 1 p.xlv in Benson Mates, *The Philosophy of Leibniz: Metaphysics and Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986) footnote 87, p.34

comments on the *Essay* and he responded with merely polite and conventional expressions of gratitude. (In private Locke was scathing about the quality of Leibniz's criticisms.)"[72] With Locke seemingly unwilling to enter into debate: "… Leibniz might have simply given up at this stage, but then in 1700 the French translation of Locke's *Essay* was published."[73] The publication of this translation: "… was doubly significant: it made it easier for Locke to study Locke's philosophy carefully, and it alerted Leibniz to the fact that the Essay would be assured of a wide continental readership."[74]

With a possibility of wide readership of Locke's philosophy: "… Leibniz wrote a point-by-point commentary on the *Essay* which he later turned into a dialogue."[75] By writing an in depth analysis of Locke's *Essay*: "[Leibniz] clearly intended to publish the work with the aim of forcing Locke to reply finally to his criticisms."[76] Leibniz's work, *New Essays on Human Understanding* (1704) was almost ready for publication but was prevented from release with the death of Locke in 1704. The reason for stopping its release was: "… partly on the ground that it would be unfair to publish a critique when its target could no longer defend himself, and partly on the ground that he could not now achieve his aim of engaging Locke in public debate. As a result the *New Essays on Human Understanding* lay buried among Leibniz's manuscripts in Hanover until fifty years after his death."[77]

[72] Nicholas Jolley, *Leibniz*, p.24
[73] Ibid
[74] Ibid
[75] Ibid
[76] Ibid
[77] Ibid, p.25

Despite holding different philosophical ideas Leibniz's *New Essays*, as with his initial review of Locke's *Essay* in 1695, was not written in opposition to Locke's empiricism. As Alexander notes "Leibniz was by no means wholly critical of Locke, and he in considerable admiration for and agreement with him."[78] This view is also shared by Jolley who states, "Predictably the *New Essays* has been seen as a classic confrontation between rationalist and empiricist theories of knowledge. In fact, however, it is clear from Leibniz's statements about the work that his main aim is not to refute Locke's theory of knowledge at all … it is rather to defend an immaterialist theory of mind against what he regarded as Locke's insidious attacks on the doctrine"[79]

Leibniz agrees with Locke in using general names or *appellatives* in the *New Essays*: "General terms do not merely improve languages but are required for their essential structure … if we only had words which applied to them – only *proper names* and no *appellatives* – we would not be able to say anything."[80] Comparable to Locke's view, by using general terms we are able to communicate the same idea to each other. This is otherwise impossible if using a private language where the idea is distorted through a nonsensical language. In order to illustrate this, Leibniz uses the example of children or those learning a foreign language who make mistakes in their attribution of names: "… you will see children and people who are trying to speak an unfamiliar language, or speak about unfamiliar matters, employ general terms like

[78] Peter Alexander, 'Solidity and Elasticity in the Seventeenth Century' in *Locke's Philosophy: Content and Context* p.151
[79] Nicholas Jolley, *Leibniz*, p.25
[80] Gottfried Leibniz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*, trans. and ed. by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) Book 3, Section 275-6.

'thing', 'plant', 'animal', in place of the more specific terms which they do not have."[81] It is through our dependence on general terms that Leibniz suggests that proper names were once accepted general terms: "… It is certain that all proper or individual names were originally appellative or general."[82] A proper name, for Leibniz, is not a nonsensical idea (glarb) or an inventive grammatical structure that is created (Klingon). This is because a proper name is a forgotten term and due to this it has a genealogy that can be traced in order to find its meaning: "I would venture to say that almost all words were originally general terms, since it will very rarely happen that a name will be invented just for one given individual without any reason for it. So we can say that individual names used to be names of species which were given to some individual either as a prime example of the species or for some other reason."[83]

Leibniz gives an example of Roman names. The reason for this is because they a particular reason why they were given a *proper name*: "… proper names such as Brutus, Caesar, Augustus … the first Brutus was given this name because of his apparent stupidity, that Caesar was the name of a child delivered through an incision in his mother's abdomen … Augustus was a name expressing reverence."[84]. Leibniz also explains an etymological reason for attributing *proper names* to mountains: "*Alps* are snowcovered mountains (compare *album,* white), and Brenner and Pyrenees signify great height, for *bren* in Celtic meant high or chief (compare *Brennus),* just as *brink* still means height in Low Saxon - there is a Brenner between

[81] Ibid, Section 276
[82] Ibid
[83] Ibid, Section 289
[84] Ibid

Germany and Italy, and a Pyrenees between Gaul and Spain."[85] As Richard T.W. Arthur explains Leibniz's interest in the evolution of language: "…Leibniz was deeply interested in the evolution of natural languages, which he sought to uncover with detailed historical (including archival) research into the oldest writings available."[86] One particular line of research "… led him to believe that the Germanic and Nordic languages as well as Britannic and Gaelic 'can be regarded as variants of a single language which could be called 'Celtic'."[87] However, as Arthur notes the problem with Leibniz's etymological analysis is that it lacks any references or evidence to confirm his theories: "In the *New Essays* Leibniz provides several pages of such etymological studies, but cautions that one must always be careful to try to find confirming evidence of supposed derivations … otherwise one will … produce fanciful and ridiculous etymologies …"[88]

However, Leibniz does not think it is universally true in every instance that a proper name has an etymological root and relation to a more commonly used general term. This is because there are instances in which a general name is the only name used and so it is impossible to trace any other origin. A reason for this is due to a general term being preferred to a variety of proper names. This is explained by Leibniz in reference to the designation of the same term of wormwood in order to explain the variety of species: "… we shall be satisfied with a vaguer or more general term to designate a more specific kind, if the differentiae are of no interest to us; for instance we are satisfied with the general term wormwood, even though there are so

[85] Ibid
[86] Richard T.W. Arthur, *Leibniz* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014) p.50
[87] Ibid
[88] Ibid

many species of it …"[89] A general term is then preferential to a proper name when it is of little interest for us to name every specific difference. An example of this is evident in the use of the general term of woodworm to designate the various different larvae of wood-boring beetles. As Norman E. Hickman states "About three hundred different species of wood-boring beetles are known as occurring in our domestic woodwork indoors, but of these only seven are of frequent occurrence, and it is to the larval or grub stage that we apply the description 'woodworm'."[90]

For Leibniz, the problem of singularity emerges through the use of a general term. This is because general terms do not represent the variations and differences between qualities in each individual. In other words, it is through the use of resemblance that an individual associates particular ideas. In using resemblance, an individual negates singular qualities of objects into the same shared general properties: "… [a] child proceeds by abstraction from observing the idea of man to observing that of [an] animal, he arrived at the idea of human nature from the more specific idea which he observed his mother and father and other people."[91] A child arrives at a general idea of human nature by recognising a resemblance of similar qualities from individuals that they come into contact with: their parents, teachers and so forth. It is therefore by having our own understanding of a name that enables each usage to be distinguished and different from another individual's use of the same word. As Fabrizio Mandadori states "According to [Leibniz's] view, proper names name only by describing the objects they name, they name just in case there is a unique object 'satisfying' their sense (that object being accordingly the referent of the name) and their sense can be characterized as what serves to distinguish the

[89] Leibniz, *New Essays*, Section 289
[90] Norman E. Hickin, 'Woodworm and its control', *The New Scientist*, Vol. 4., No. 83, 19th June 1958, p.202
[91] Leibniz, *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, Book 3, Section 290

individual (if any) named by them from all other individuals."[92] This same idea of human nature is then associated with animals. It is from this association of human nature to animals that Leibniz is implicitly referring to the capacity of each individual to reason. Not all individuals share the same capacity to reason and so it is easier to understand our relation to animals. That is, the less intellectual we think about the world the more prone we are to acting violently and stupidly. This would be not the case if we reflected on our actions.

The problem with this idea of human nature is that we form negates the singular qualities of each individual: "That he had no precise idea of the individual is shown by the fact that he could easily be deceived by a moderate resemblance into mistaking some other woman for his mother."[93] It is in the problem of generalisation that Leibniz refers to Martin Guerre, a famous of a case of mistaken identity: "You know the story of the false Martin Guerre who fooled even the wife and close relatives of the real one by his resemblance to him, combined with his cunning, and for a long time puzzled the judges even after the real one had turned up."[94] In this case, Guerre had disappeared after an argument. After a period of eight years an individual turned up claiming to be Guerre. However, as Paul Aron states, suspicions were raised when: "… in 1558, Martin asked his uncle Pierre Guerre, for his share of the profits from the family farm during his absence."[95] Pierre's suspicion was further added to when: "… two soldiers passing through the village said they'd served with Martin Guerre and that he'd lost a leg during the war. Yet the [man who claimed to

[92] Fabrizio Mondadori 'Reference, Essentialism, and Modality in Leibniz's Metaphysics' in R. S. Woolhouse (ed.), *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Metaphysics and its foundations* (London: Routledge,1994)p.230
[93] Leibniz, *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, Book 3, Section 290
[94] Ibid
[95] Paul D. Aron, *Mysteries in History: From Prehistory to the Present* (California: Abc-Clio Inc., 2006) p.167

be Martin] clearly had both legs."[96] The case was taken to court and in a shocking turn of events the actual Martin Guerre turned up just as the sentence was about to be passed. This lead to the imposter Guerre being revealed as Arnauld du Tilh who was from a neighbouring village.

The case of the mistaken identity of Martin Guerre is significant for Leibniz because, based upon an empirical understanding, we were led into error due to resemblance. When using an empirical understanding, like Martin's family members, we accept general qualities as a true representation. Yet these general qualities do not represent a true identity. A true identity is the singular qualities that enable an individual to be unique and differentiated from others. Leibniz challenges Locke's use of general terms as able to maintain singularity and differentiation. For instance, using Leibniz's example, we can see how children fall into error in the judgment of recognizing their parents through general qualities. Their mother or father has a general hair of X, clothes colours of A, B, C. When in a busy area and having lost sight of their parents, a child may run up to another individual who also has hair colour X and clothes colours of A, B, C. A child then realizes that they were mistaken when the other individual turns around to face them. It is in the process of facing the child that they recognize the singular qualities of their parents against the general qualities that allows them to be differentiated from other individuals.

Therefore, as Donald W. Mertz notes Leibniz's position is not resemblance nominalism. This is because: "what Leibniz is suggesting cannot be simply resemblance nominalism, where the latter is understood as exact resemblance …

[96] Ibid

since this violates his position that relations are *entia rationis*. What are real, as opposed to merely ideal, are 'separated things' and their properties."[97] Leibniz's position can then be defined as closer to Ostrich nominalism, as Gonzalo Rodiguez-Pereyra states "[for Leibniz] the similarity of substances derives not from the similarity of their accidents but from how substances intrinsically are: that is, substances A and B resemble each other because they are F, not the other way around. But this does not mean Leibniz is reifying accidents or properties. Thus … Leibniz is closer to what has been called Ostrich Nominalism than to Resemblance Nominalism."[98] This is because Ostrich nominalism affirms metaphysical nature of difference in Leibniz's philosophy. In this way, difference is not dependent upon speech and a subject but rather each object is naturally different from one another. As Rodiguez-Pereyra remarks "… *Ostrich Nominalism*. This view, held by Quine, among others, maintains that there is nothing in virtue of which our thing is scarlet: it just is scarlet."[99]

Conclusion

From Locke, it has been suggested that we must make sense of an idea in order to correctly understand it. In making sense we associate particular worldly qualities to ideas. Following this, our experience and social and cultural backgrounds influence the way in which we understand an idea. Based upon these backgrounds individuals will have different understandings of the same idea. Following this, a problem of

---

[97] Donald W. Mertz, *Moderate Realism and Its Logic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996) p.149

[98] Gonzalo Rodiguez- Pereyra, *Leibniz's Principle of Identity of Indiscernibles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) p.199

[99] Gonzalo Rodiguez-Pereyra, 'Nominalism in Metaphysics', 2015, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nominalism-metaphysics/ [accessed 16th February 2016]

communication arises, as it is difficult to understand another individual's understanding of an idea. This is because we can only relate to our personal experience and background. In order to overcome this problem Locke suggests that social and cultural conventions should be adhered to. For instance, if visiting a different part of a country or a foreign country it might be difficult to understand each other. If we begin to understand the social and cultural context then this allows us access to another individual's different sense of an idea.

However, Leibniz's close commentary of Locke in the *New Essays* reveals a paradox between general names and the world. Leibniz agrees with Locke that general names are beneficial. We should adhere to the socially accepted usage of a name in order to reflect upon the same communicated idea. General names are also beneficial since it avoids the problem of a nonsensical language in the attribution of a unique name to everything in the world. But for Leibniz, everything in the world is completely unique (his concept of monads is discussed in Chapter 4). In other words, no two things share the same qualities. To compare qualities would negate their singular qualities. This demonstrates the limits of language since we cannot adequately describe singularity. Each explanation of a unique quality would describe its general properties. For instance, a child can recognize their parents through identifying the singular qualities of their face or voice. Yet using the terms 'Mum' or 'Dad' negates the unique qualities of the child's parents through their generalization in the general term. Therefore, this demonstrates the paradoxical relationship between sense and meaning. We must use general terms in order to be understood. Yet our unique sense cannot be expressed through those terms.

The next chapter will analyse the relationship of sense and meaning in Nietzsche's philosophy of language. An initial discussion of Deleuze's critical view of education and the teaching of philosophy will be made. This is in order to develop a connection between Deleuze, Locke, Leibniz, and Nietzsche. A connection can be made by their emphasis upon the process of sense rather than solely upon the attainment of meaning. In other words, individuals should not simply repeat values or answers but arrive at understanding for themselves. For Nietzsche, in contrast to Locke, an individual's understanding is burdened by their complete acceptance of social and cultural conventions. These problems will be developed through a discussion of herd mentality, the role of transcendental concepts and of origins in society and philosophy. This allows for Nietzsche's emphasis upon sense to be identified in his early advocacy of the analysis of rhetorical processes in language and also in a brief discussion of its development in his later philosophy. It is therefore the aim of the next chapter to further problematize Locke's adherence to general terms and whether it is a worthwhile endeavor for an individual to turn their back upon the use of socially and culturally determined usage of terms.

1

Nietzsche, Sense and Transcendent signs

Introduction

The introductory analysis of Locke's concept of sense has enabled us to define it as an empirical process. This is because in order to understand things in the world we attribute specific worldly qualities to a sign. A worldly quality is then a socially agreed upon context. If we are unable to do so then we are left with, as Locke argues, a blank idea. This blank idea or sign challenges the rationalist assumption that individuals only need to rationally reflect upon the sign in order to correctly know. For rationalists, the process of rational reflection upon a sign leads to clear understanding. In this way, a material object is not strictly defined according to its experiential qualities but according to a distinct metaphysical sign. The benefit of the rationalist approach is that it enables universal reflection upon the same sign. Regardless of individuals' social or cultural backgrounds, their environments or epochs, the same correct understanding can be attained. Locke's challenge to the rationalist approach, on the surface level, is to demonstrate the importance of our social, cultural, environmental backgrounds and time periods as having a lasting effect on how we construct different ideas.

However, on a deeper philosophical level, Locke challenges the rationalist assumption that meaning is inherent and presupposed. That is, in challenging innatism, Locke objects to the notion that meaning is based upon a transcendent or

metaphysical foundation. Individuals give meaning to the world by making sense of signs. Starting from a blank sign, an individual has not sought to attain an absolute understanding of everything in the world, but has constructed a worldly meaning. For instance, if we only learn the native language of a country, we leave utterances in non-native languages blank, because we remain incapable of arriving at a clear innate understanding of them.

Deleuze's philosophy can be related to Locke's through the problem of maintaining the dynamic relationship between sense and meaning. This problem can be related to Deleuze's time as a student and his education in studying the history of philosophy: "At the Liberation [of Paris] we were strangely stuck in the history of philosophy. We simply plunged into Hegel, Husserl and Heidegger; we threw ourselves like puppies into a scholasticism worse than that of the Middle Ages."[100] Deleuze, like most philosophy students, was introduced to philosophy by studying its key figures. This was to be familiarised with the popular school of thought in France at the time, phenomenology. Yet for Deleuze this educational model had a negative impact upon the development of his own understanding of key philosophical figures and their concepts: "The history of philosophy has always been the agent of power in philosophy, and even in thought. It played the repressor's role: how can you think without having read Plato, Descartes, Kant … An image of thought called philosophy has been formed historically and it effectively stops people from thinking."[101]

The history of philosophy prevents our own understanding from developing due to the same association of particular meaning with a philosopher's concept (the

[100] Gilles Deleuze, Claire Parnet, *Dialogues* trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987) p.12
[101] Ibid, p.13

cogito always means X, the monad always means Y, the Platonic Idea always means Z …) The same association of particular meaning with a philosopher's concept enables students to engage with a philosopher, understand their philosophy and their importance in the history of philosophy. It is through the process of communicating the expected given meaning that a student's understanding is demonstrated to be correct. If a student does not communicate the expected meaning then they can be corrected until it adheres to the given expectation.

Despite this educational benefit, Deleuze demonstrates that by always associating the same given meaning transforms the concept into a blank idea. This is because the student must always give an expected meaning in order to be correct. In repeating this information the student has not gained a greater understanding of it for himself or herself. This highlights an educational problem, namely, how can a student attain understanding without negating his or her own process of apprenticeship? This is because in its standard educational model, the process of making sense is denied. A student does not need to make sense of anything since everything has a predetermined meaning that the student must communicate. By not needing to make sense of anything, individuals *do not think for themselves* as every thought that is made can be connected and related to a prior thought that was already made. Statements made would always be related to its historicity (the idea of X is related to school of thought Y). Each attempt that an individual express a different understanding would be compared and judged according to a thought already made (Your idea of X is related to Y). This comparison negates its uniqueness as the school of thought or philosopher is privileged over any other thought that is made (The notion of X expressed by school of thought Y is much

better than your Idea of X). In relation to language, an individual's different understanding cannot be expressed since each expression must conform to a general signification (X expresses sign of Y).

For instance, this can be related to schools of thought in philosophy where various philosophers are argued to share similar views. For Deleuze, the generalisation of concepts and philosophies prevent unique differences between philosophers. This can be related to his remarks on Hume's concept of empiricism:

> … every history of philosophy has its chapter on empiricism: Locke and Berkeley have their place there, but in Hume there is something very strange which displaces empiricism, giving it a new power, a theory and practice of relations … but which belongs underground or marginal in relation to the great classifications, even when they inspire a new conception of logic and epistemology.[102]

Traditionally the school of empiricism is generalised to include Locke, Hume and Berkeley. However, for Deleuze, this generalisation of the concept of empiricism takes us away from the unique views held within each philosophy that prevents them from being so easily categorised. In this way, there is a displacement of the general concept when taking into account each unique perspective of it. Hume's concept of empiricism retains a unique and contrasting sense whilst being classified under the general term with other empiricist thinkers. It is this unique perspective that we encounter when reading a philosopher. It is a mistake to assume that every

[102] Deleuze, Parnet, *Dialogues*, p.15

philosopher holds the similar view to another when using the same concept. When reading a philosopher we encounter their unique understanding of a concept (Hume empiricism is X, Locke's Y, Berkeley's Z). These differences in concepts transform the general image of empiricism that is placed upon each philosopher. A generalisation then cannot properly explain the differences between each view of empiricism as a general view is taken (All views signify X).

For Deleuze, it was Nietzsche who provided a different approach to the reading of philosophers from the traditional academic approach: "It was Nietzsche, who I read only later, who extricated me from all this. Because you just can't deal with him in the same sort of way. He gets up to all sorts of things behind *your* back. He gives you a perverse taste--certainly something neither Marx nor Freud ever gave anyone-for saying simple things in your own way, in affects, intensities, experiences, experiments."[103] Nietzsche does not provide a criterion for interpretation (Freud) or a criterion for revolutionary change (Marx) but enables a way in which structure is constructed through the development of our understanding. This is because the process of making sense remains separate to the meaning of a word. When we no longer take into account the process of making sense and its relation to meaning, it becomes part of a universal criterion. Each interpretation that is made must conform to the general meaning. Any alternative understanding of a word would always be denied in preference to the criterion (My sense of X as Z is wrong because it does not fit the general criterion which states X is always Y.) This enables knowledge itself to be static where no different understanding could emerge.

[103] Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations*, trans. Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995) p.6

Deleuze's interpretation of Nietzsche's philosophy as exposing processes of understanding within transcendent or metaphysical foundations continues into his view of reconstruction of the concept of philosophy in *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. In *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Deleuze's reading of Nietzsche is designed to enable a positive sense of Nietzsche's concepts and philosophy to emerge. To include the word philosophy to Nietzsche can be seen as shocking following Russell's criticism in his *History of Western Philosophy* (1945)[104]: How can Nietzsche's philosophy be philosophical when it has no clear philosophical assumptions? This is what Deleuze intends to do, not to reinstate a general understanding of Nietzsche through a school of thought but to revalue the concept of philosophy. For Deleuze, a different concept of philosophy is needed because of Nietzsche's questioning of truth and its relation to language:

> Nietzsche questions the concept of truth, he denies that the true can be an element of language. What he is contesting is the very notions of true and false. Not because he wants to 'relativize' them like an ordinary skeptic. In their place he substitutes sense and value as rigorous notions: the sense of what one says, and the evaluation of the one saying it. You always get the truth you deserve according to the sense of what you say, and according to

[104] This can be seen in Russell's statement "Nietzsche, though a professor, was a *literary* rather than an academic philosopher. He invented no new technical theories in ontology or epistemology; his importance is primarily in ethics, and secondarily as an acute historical critic." Bertrand Russell, *The History of Western Philosophy* (Woking: Unwin Brothers Limited, 1947) p.788. For Russell, there are no philosophical aspects to Nietzsche's thought because there is no stable philosophical foundation or system of philosophy. This is due to the lack of any concepts that could affirm a universal truth: "It does not occur to Nietzsche as possible that a man should genuinely feel universal love." Ibid, p.795. In contrast, this universal love Russell argues is something that all share in: "Nietzsche despises universal love; I feel it the motive power to all that I desire as regards the world." Ibid, p.800 An example of this need for universal values can be seen in his criticism of Nietzsche's *Beyond Good And Evil* , "[the book] really aims at changing the reader's opinion as to what is good and what is evil, but professes, except at moments, to be praising what is 'evil' and decrying what is 'good'" Ibid, p.790

> the values *to which you give voice.* This presupposes a radically new conception of thought and language, because sense and value, signification and evaluation, bring into play mechanisms of the unconscious.[105]

Emphasising the importance of the evaluation of meaning presupposes a completely different conception for thought and language. This is because the process of evaluation and interpretation is subject to worldly and unconscious processes at work which make an individual hold certain values as true and false (The underlying conditions for stating X is Y are A, B, C). Nietzsche thereby challenges a transcendent foundation since truth always remains conditioned and affected by worldly forces. Yet this is not to say that there do not exist any forms of truth whatsoever in Nietzsche's philosophy. Truths are conditioned by the values that attempt to hold a given perspective as the correct meaning (At the given time period the values of A, B, C were of importance this influenced the thought at the time that X always meant Y). This would mean an individual cannot absolutely affirm that a certain truth is always correct. Truth is continually transforming effected by different perspectives, social, political, cultural forces or our environment, as Brook Thomas argues "… Nietzsche emphasises the distortions and violations required in order to bring about such a consistent stability."[106]

The chapter analyses Nietzsche's philosophy of language in order to understand why it is necessary to analyse processes and worldly forces underlying meaning. Comparable to Locke, this is to argue that meaning is not pure or absolute

[105] Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts*, ed. by David Lapoujade, trans. by Michael Taormina (London: Semiotext(e), 2004) pp.135-6
[106] Brook Thomas, *The New Historicism: And Other Old-Fashioned Topics*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991) p.104

but dependent upon how we understand, or make sense of things in the world. These initial relations to sense and meaning are then strengthened through a denial of a causal origin for language, the role of rhetoric in its relation to sense and the tension of an individual's acceptance of social norms. The denial of a causal origin for language is analysed in Nietzsche's brief essay *On the Origin of Language*. The remarks made by Nietzsche on philosophers are very brief. Due to this, it is necessary to fully expand upon these remarks by discussing the criticism in context with the given thinkers' view. The views that will be expanded upon are Rousseau's emotional gesture, de Brosses' natural association, Mondobbo's divine ideogram, and Herder's reflection upon expression. Following this, an analysis of rhetoric develops Nietzsche's argument by emphasising the importance of the role of sense. It will be argued that, *in contrast to Locke, meaning is in a continual state of becoming. In other words, our understanding is in a continual process of making sense of the world. In this way, meaning is not absolute or in a continual process of redefinition at different periods in time. The attainment of meaning is novel since we continually make sense of things differently.* This radical concept of meaning allows us to understand developments in Nietzsche's philosophy where individuals must become opposed to social norms by demonstrating its absurdity. It in Nietzsche's later philosophical concepts of revaluation and the eternal return where its necessary for an individual to continually revaluate their understanding and thereby affirm a continual challenge to societies' values and their own preconceptions.

Problems with a transcendent foundation for knowledge

In his brief essay, *On the Origin of Language* written in 1869-70, the same year that he became Chair of Classical Philology at the University of Basel, Nietzsche outlines

how the problem of language has been treated in the history of philosophy. Nietzsche's remarks are critical of the role of the creation and necessity of a foundation within philosophy. He is critical of both the transcendent philosophy (Plato) and Kant's transcendental philosophy. Against these positions he argues that we need to affirm worldly processes, sense making and multiple perspectives. Despite being an everyday occurrence, philosophy has traditionally argued that language is: "…*neither the conscious work of individuals nor of a plurality*."[107] This is because philosophers have sought a transcendent foundation for language.

Traditionally, a transcendent foundation is beneficial for our understanding since it provides a stable structure. What is discovered is an absolute causal basis that serves to always explain the reason for why phenomena behave in a certain manner. For Nietzsche, this absolute basis for knowledge is negative since it denies other possible causes for an origin. In relation to understanding, it also prevents the development of novel or different uses of structures by privileging the one method as providing the best means for education. In relation to language, this privileges role of the Idea rather than an expression. In doing so, there is a denial of the development of language itself, the novel and different uses of language that occur over time.

The privileged role of a transcendent cause or signifier then takes such precedence that any individual nor a number of worldly affects (social, cultural, environmental forces) cannot either create language or affect language. Nietzsche then highlights the problem of developing a new thought in philosophy: "all conscious thought is possible only with the help of language. It is absolutely impossible to have such a

[107] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, ed. and trans. by Sander L. Gilman, Carole Blair and David J. Parent (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) p.209

clever thought … [since] the deepest philosophical insights are already implicitly contained in language."[108] Thought itself is dependent upon language. It is impossible to think without a means of expression. Without language this would mean Ideas would remain forever trapped without any means of actualising them. Yet the removal of the individual's creation and affectual relation to language means that it is impossible to develop differences between our ideas. This is because each thought would not be new or show a completely different knowledge of something since each expression is always the same (it doesn't matter if its in Ancient Greek, Medieval English or contemporary French). That is, a transcendent cause acts as an ultimate value where various different valuations always reflect the same value. In this way, language itself negates different thoughts from emerging and developing as it denies a different means of expressing the uniqueness of these ideas. Each expression of a thought reflects the same meaning. As Wayne Klein notes "the philosopher's error is dependent on errors in language is ... implied in the temporal structure of Nietzsche's narrative."[109] The error that philosophers make is because "we are forced into error as soon as we begin to refer to a world of stable objects existing in space and time."[110] This expression is based upon an ideality since it is unable to account for actuality, a world of continual change and becoming: "the senses do not lie insofar as they show becoming, change and alteration."[111] Philosophers traditionally create a metaphysical foundation in order to resolve problems and provide an absolutely stable basis. However, we see that this metaphysical foundation further detaches us from reality: "the philosopher who posits

[108] Ibid
[109] Wayne Klein, *Nietzsche and the Promise of Philosophy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997) p.92
[110] Ibid
[111] Ibid

a ‘true’ world is unable to escape from error, but merely adds one error to another …”[112]

Nietzsche illuminates this problem in philosophy through a discussion of Kant and quotes from the *Critique of Pure Reason*: “A great part, perhaps the greatest part of the work of reason consists in analyzing the concepts which man finds pre-existing in himself.”[113]These pre-existing concepts in Kant’s philosophy are the *a priori* categories[114]. An individual must move from an analysis of experiential phenomena to one based upon rational reflection. By rationally reflecting we can achieve understanding of metaphysical (or which Kant describes as noumenal) ideas. For Kant, we can never achieve a complete understanding based upon pure rational reflection. This is because, comparable to Locke, our idea would remain blank. Yet Kant maintains that we are still able to arrive at an understanding of a thing even if we cannot fully represent them by making sense of them: “… even if we cannot *cognize* these same objects as things in themselves, we must at least be able to *think* them as things in themselves. For otherwise there would follow the absurd proposition that there is an appearance without anything that appears.”[115]

[112] Ibid, p.93
[113] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.209
[114] A problem for Kant’s philosophical project was how to maintain metaphysics without it denying experience (the rationalist position of *a priori* not *a posteriori*) and how to maintain experience without it denying metaphysics (the empiricist position of *a posteriori* not *a priori)*. As Roger Scruton argues “it was already apparent to Kant that empiricism denies the possibility of metaphysics. And yet metaphysics is necessary if foundations are to be provided for objective knowledge: without it, there is no conceivable barrier against Hume’s scepticism.” Roger Scruton, *Kant: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) pp.28-30 This formed a foundation for Kant’s project in *Critique of Pure Reason* to show that: "In opposition to Hume, to show that synthetic *a priori* knowledge is possible ... [and] in opposition to Leibniz, to demonstrate that 'pure reason' alone, operating outside the constraints placed on it by experience, leads only to illusion, so that there is no a priori knowledge of things-in-themselves." Ibid p.31
[115] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. and ed. by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) p.115

In making sense of a metaphysical object we can associate empirical qualities to it and are able to comprehend it. For instance, we are able to understand the idea of infinity by relating it to empirical objects such as the sea. As thought must conform to empirical conditions Kant conceives of twelve categories of understanding that provide *a priori* conditions for an experience to occur and are demonstrable within experience. This can be seen in Herbert James Paton's commentary "Kant's whole argument turns on the possibility of experience, experience being always a compound of intuition and thought. Unless given intuitions or appearances can be thought, they cannot give us knowledge or experience. But if they are to be thought or judged, they must conform to the conditions or forms of judgment, and therefore to the categories."[116]

For Nietzsche, as Kant's philosophy limits our knowledge solely to the phenomenal realm, it prevents us from being able to learn. This is because the *a priori* categories are absolute and prevent any alternative category to be presented in the future and also prevent an alternative opinion from Kant about how the category functions. As Catherine H. Zuckert states "philosophy has been traditionally been understood to be the search for wisdom ... with Kant that search culminated only in the knowledge that we cannot know."[117] In other words, Kant's categories act as an absolute foundation where we cannot reach different or alternative categories. This foundation denies an interaction or explanation of the immediate immanent qualities of the experiential qualities that Kant's own system wants to affirm. The problem then lies with our use of reason. In order to know we must always use rational reflection. Yet in doing so, we do not reflect upon the immediate object but

[116] Herbert James Paton, *Kant's Metaphysic of Experience*, Vol.1 (London: Routledge, 2002) p.472
[117] Catherine H. Zuckert, *Postmodern Platos* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996) p.10

the ideal one. An earlier contemporary, Friedrich Jacobi, of Kant's also highlights this problem, as Olav Bryant Smith remarks "… as early as 1787 [Jacobi] criticized the inconsistency in Kant's system … Jacobi argued that in reasoning, human beings establish a distance from which to reflect upon the representation. Such reflective thinking … cannot help but be far removed from experienced reality."[118] The rational model's abstraction from reality then led to an idealistic view of the world that was detached from actuality.

Nietzsche continues to highlight a problem of education through the process of an individual making sense of an idea is considered to be harmful: "the development of conscious thinking is harmful to language."[119] The development of one's own sense is to come to the knowledge of what a thing is differently from the given meaning (My understanding of X means Y whilst it traditionally means Z). This is because different connections and relations would be assembled in understanding a meaning (His understanding of X means Y is effected by various social, cultural and political forces of B, C and D). Following this, each understanding of a given meaning would not be universal but subjective. In this way, meaning is not absolute but composed of different contrasting opinions. The move from absolute basis to multiplicity is harmful for an individual's understanding. It is harmful because an individual can no longer be certain of a given meaning. This leads to a distortion in their understanding where any possible opinion could be correct knowledge. Therefore in order for attain clarity for one's own understanding and have correct knowledge we must move away from a multiplicity of contrasting opinions to one absolute view. In order to avoid harm an individual's understanding must conform to

[118] Olav Bryant Smith, *Myths of the Self: Narrative Identity and Postmodern Metaphysics* (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2004) p.28
[119] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.209

its universal expectation. Each subjective opinion would then not differ but be reflective of the same generality. For instance, this view of language can be seen in Plato's *Cratylus* (this is analysed further in Chapter 5). Put simply, Hermogenes, a friend of Socrates, advocates a subjective argument where meaning would differ between each individual. Plato criticises this view since no clear understanding of a meaning could ever be reached. In order for individuals to attain a correct understanding their knowledge must be reflective of the same general Idea. Knowledge of an Idea would therefore be gradually arrived at through rational reflection, which would combine similarities of various qualities together.

In contrast to this transcendent model for our thought, Nietzsche states "Decadence is caused by advanced culture. The formal element which has philosophical value is damaged. Think of the French language … all final syllables are eroded away; the stem syllables are distorted beyond recognition. A more highly developed culture is even incapable of preserving from decay what was handed down to it complete."[120] That is, the privileging of a given meaning, a transcendent concept, is to have a decadent system of language. This decadence is based on an 'advanced culture'; this term is a sign of Nietzsche's humour. It is humorous because it challenges and parodies an image of thought from Enlightenment thinking. In short, in the Age of Enlightenment it was held that man with the aid of Reason was in continual progression towards a utopian society. As Roy Porter states "Reason alone (Enlighteners tended to believe) would afford a total knowledge of man, society, Nature and the cosmos; [this] would enable them to mount a critique of the political and the religious *status quo*; and, above all, would provide the foundations for a

[120] Ibid

utopian future."[121] Nietzsche is therefore questioning the premise that reason is an act of the intellect, pure reflection, and free from all worldly influences. This is because it is the sign of a decadent and aristocratic culture that influenced that creation of such transcendent concepts. In other words, it is a decadent lifestyle itself that is reflected in philosophy of seeking a seeking a utopian or ideal future state that is greater than their current one. In this way, philosophy itself becomes damaged since it no longer retains its critical or sceptical aspect due to the obedience to rationalist philosophy that seeks to establish an absolute foundation for knowledge.

It is therefore Kant's attempted complete resolution of the empirical and rationalist problems that is considered to be harmful. This is because the complete resolution of a problem attempts to forestall any further attempt at making sense of it. Knowledge then becomes dogmatic and remains closed to any further responses to these problems. The benefit of the continued returning to make sense of problems is then to allow for alternative answers to be given. It is also to allow for a continued engagement with a given problem over time; to allow for the problem to function and transform in relation to different social and cultural environments and in different time periods. In contrast to attempting to fully resolve a problem it can be returned to and transformed in a positive and constructive manner. This can be seen in Deleuze's early work that offers an alternative reading to Kant's definitions of rationalist and empiricist philosopher. For instance, Deleuze's reading of Spinoza in *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza (1968) and Spinoza: Practical Philosophy (1970)* challenges Kant's view based by demonstrating the immanent and empirical qualities of Spinoza's philosophy.

[121] Roy Porter, *The Enlightenment*, 2nd edition (New York: Palgrave, 2001) p.2

A genealogy of language and its various origins

After his critical analysis of transcendent and transcendental philosophical foundations, Nietzsche continues to show how worldly influences affect our thought and language. This is demonstrated through analyzing the phonetic changes in language over time. The necessity of these phonetic differences then affirms the social, cultural environmental, and historical influence upon language (William Labov's phonetic analysis that also takes this into consideration occurs in Chapter 3.) This is in contrast to a traditional philosophical approach that denies phonetics altogether in preference to a causal foundation or transcendent origin. Nietzsche illustrates the fragility of language through the example of the eradication of elements from the French language. In relation to the French language the eradication of aspects of its development was apparent through different invasions. As Jean-Benoit Nadeau and Julie Barlow argue "when the Roman victors showed up … it didn't take long for the Gaulish elite to start speaking Latin."[122] Due to this popularity of speaking Latin "the Gaulish language ended up contributing very little to the vocabulary of modern French. Only about a hundred words survived the centuries, mostly rural and agricultural terms such as *bouleau* (birch) … *mouton* (sheep) … and *boue* (mud)."[123] Despite its minor influence "…Gaulish is still relatively known, partly because it left many place and family names in northern France. For example, the name Paris comes from the Parisii, a Gaulish tribe …"[124]

[122] Jean-Benoit Nadeau and Julie Barlow, *The Story of French* (London: Anova Books, 2008) p.22
[123] Ibid
[124] Ibid

This eradication of different styles of language is also related to the origins of language itself: "… there was supposedly a condition without language, with only gestures and shrieks. Then conventional gestures and shrieks were established. These means could have been perfected into a pantomimed language of shrieks and song. But that would have been precarious. Not everyone is skilled at correct intonation and precise hearing."[125] That is, there was thought to be a pure phonetic language before pronunciation took place. This was where each object could be identified and distinguished by a different tone. As Raimo Anttila explains "…phoneticians, around the turn of the century, developed transcription systems intended to be truly phonetic … but it was soon realized that one could never reach the ultimate logical goal of one symbol for each sound in the sum total of all known languages. The obstacle results from the fact that nobody pronounces the 'same sound' twice…"[126] For instance, this phonetic language can be ascribed to a caveman. A caveman is portrayed with only grunts and groans without any capacity for speech. Yet this caveman language was not perfected. The grunts and groans were not made into a language because not everyone would be capable of creating the right tones [No it's a# for yes not c flat]. This shrieking language is replaced by using a new mode of expression "[by] using the tongue and lips, it was possible to produce a certain amount of articulation. The new language was felt to be advantageous and so was retained."[127] A transformation of shrieking occurred; it was no longer acceptable to use a commonplace shrieking but something different. In accepting the new language the previous uses of tones was not eradicated but

[125] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.210
[126] Raimo Anttila, *An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics* (New York: Macmillan, 1972) p.207
[127] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.210

transformed in such a way in which they could be affirmed. Following this, it did not matter whether the tone was correct or not but only the pronunciation.

In order to understand these various transformations of language throughout time, a pure origin is sought. This pure origin enables us to understand how we were able to gain the capacity to communicate. Yet, on a deeper level, it enables a universal foundation for meaning. That is, regardless of differences in language over time or grammatical variations within languages, we all would be able to understand the same timeless ideas. Nietzsche analyses these claims for a pure origin for language and remarks that it has been debated as to whether this foundation was "… merely from human mental power or whether it was a direct gift from God."[128] For Nietzsche, God as an original foundation remained as an explanation due to the lack of the historical and physiological understanding of language: "That question was justified because of the scanty historical and physiological understanding of the time."[129] We must be careful here; Nietzsche is not criticizing ancient civilizations that accepted the unfolding of events as divine occurrences, but rather, the modern explanation for language as originating from transcendence. An example of this is from Rousseau (1712-1778): "Jean-Jacques Rousseau believed that language could not possibly have originated by purely human means."[130] His other examples that are analysed in the chapter are the claims for an origin for language by Charles de Brosses, Lord Monboddo, and Johann Herder. Nietzsche problematizes each case by highlighting the immanent and worldly forces that affect a claim for a transcendent foundation.

[128] Ibid
[129] Ibid
[130] Ibid

Rousseau, speech and signs as an empathetic gesture

In his *Essay on the Origin of Languages* Rousseau explains "As soon as man was recognised by another as a sentient, thinking being similar to himself, the desire or need to communicate his feelings and thoughts made him seek the means to do so."[131] Two ways in which individuals attempted to communicate was through signification by gestures or by speech. Gesturing limits our means of communication to expression through body language. This enables us to reflect upon the emotional gesture that is expressed: "Far more things affect our eyes than our ears"[132] A gesture is to express the performance of a sign. When gesturing there is an effectual relation between our body and the thing that we are attempting to portray. To illustrate this point Rousseau retells the story of Levite of Ephraim. Levite's wife was murdered and instead of writing to the tribes of Israel, he divided her body into twelve sections and sent them to the tribes. This infuriated the tribes who stated "*Never has such a thing happened in Israel, from the time of our father's going out of Egypt to present day*."[133] The sign of Levite's dismembered wife signified his revenge more than words could. This is because the dismembered body of his wife signified death. Reflecting upon this sign enabled the tribes of Israel to reflect upon their own possible deaths.

Speech enables us to have greater emotional attachment to a sign: "the passions have their gestures, but they also have their accents; and these accents which thrill us, these tones of the voice that cannot fail to be heard, penetrate to the very depth of the heart, carrying there the emotion they wring from us, forcing us in

[131] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, On the Origin of Language, trans. by John H. Moran in *Two Essays On the Origin of Language; Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gottfried Herder*, ed. and. trans. by John H. Moran and Alexander Gode (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966) p.5
[132] Ibid, p.6
[133] Ibid, p.7

spite of ourselves to feel what we hear."[134] The use of specific tones enables us to react emotionally to what is being stated. This enables us to recognise certain signs as having more value than others depending on the tone that is used. In order to show the importance of speech's relation to the sign Rousseau uses the example of someone weeping: "Imagine someone in a painful situation that is fully known; as you watch the afflicted person, you are likely not to weep. But give him time to tell you what he feels and soon you will burst into tears."[135] We are unable to immediately relate ourselves to another individual's tragic situation. However, when the other individual explains their situation to us we are then able to empathise with them. In this way, speech gives the sign of weeping an emotional power that forces an individual to reflect upon their tragic situation.

This leads Rousseau to state "…if the only needs we ever experienced were physical, we should most likely never have been able to speak; we would fully express our meanings by the language of gesture alone."[136] That is, if all that the individual sought was to satisfy bodily desires then we would never likely have developed speech. There would be no need to communicate our thoughts to one another through speech, as simple sign language would suffice. This demonstrates that, for Rousseau, individuals desire an emotional attachment to signs. We want to communicate ideas and thoughts to one another and, in doing so; we become better individuals through our emotional conveyance to each other through speech.

[134] Ibid, p.9
[135] Ibid, p.8
[136] Ibid, p.9

This allows us to return to Nietzsche's single sentence criticism of Rousseau[137]. Human language could not have originated by purely human means since we would be left with only the capacity to gesture to one another through body language. Speech is then necessary because it enables us to empathise with one another. By empathising we can reflect upon common ideals that are shared with another individual. This enables us to move away from a purely selfish means by satisfying our own bodily desires to a selfless reflection upon universal ideals shared by society. In other words, through empathising, we reflect upon a metaphysical foundation based upon universal ideals. This enables us to see how society itself, for Rousseau, is established through the act of empathy in speech: "We would not have been able to institute laws, to choose leaders, to invent arts, to establish commerce, and to do, in a word, almost as many things as we do with the help of speech."[138]

Following on from this, a critical question can be asked: Is Nietzsche suggesting that body language or a sign language based upon gestures should take on a greater importance than speech? Nietzsche is not privileging either position because he wants to demonstrate a problem of the transcendent signifier in claims for an origin or causal foundation. A transcendent signifier is a metaphysical sign that all individuals are able to rationally reflect upon. For instance, as we have demonstrated with Rousseau, through the use of speech we are able to empathise

[137] It must be noted that Nietzsche did not take into account the complexity of Rousseau's thought as Keith Ansell-Pearson states "It is evident that Nietzsche did not develop a grasp either of the subtleties, or of the complexities, of Rousseau's thought. Of Rousseau's writings, he was most familiar with *Emile* and the autobiographical pieces such as the *Confessions*." Keith Ansell-Pearson, *Nietzsche Contra Rousseau: A Study of Nietzsche's Moral and Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) p.20 Despite this, the effect of Rousseau upon Nietzsche's philosophy cannot be understated: "Rousseau's ideas, in fact, play a key role in Nietzsche's genealogy of modern decadence, which, in his writings of the mid to late 1880s, takes the form of a history of European nihilism where he locates in Rousseau's writings the origins of a distinctly modern sensibility." Ibid

[138] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Two Essays On the Origin of Language; Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gottfried Herder*, p.9

with another, and in doing so, we are able to rationally reflect upon universal ideals. The problem is that use of rational deduction moves us away from worldly processes and forces. The desiring body, the individual that acts, everyday objects, in order to propose a metaphysical methodology that determines how we think about objects or how we act in the world. Nietzsche then wants to return to us to these worldly processes in order to demonstrate that a transcendent signifier is always based upon these processes. What are these worldly processes or who creates these worldly processes? It is these questions that the shape the problem for man as a creator of language.

De Brosses and our natural association of names

Nietzsche briefly summarises the contrasting view of the human origin of language through the views of Charles de Brosses, Lord Monboddo and Johann Gottfried Herder. For Nietzsche, de Brosses' (1709-1777)[139] view "… postulates the purely human origin of language but with inadequate means. According to him, the choice of sounds depends on the nature of thing, e.g., [in French] *rude* [crude] and *doux* [sweet], and he asks 'Is not one thing crude and the other sweet?"[140] De Brosses view explains the natural association of sounds to things. This would mean a word has a natural and correct pronunciation if it matches the same signification: "because

[139] Charles de Brosses was a French jurist, scholar, anthropologist and a geographer. He was a councillor in the parlement (royal law court) of Dijon in 1730. In 1775 he became first president of the parlement. His other pursuits are succinctly described by Peter Hanns Reill and Ellen Judy Wilson "He was a close friend of David Hume and actually translated portions of *Hume's Natural History of Religion* into his own language … as a scholar, de Brosses contributed to the growth of knowledge about the antiquities of Greece and Rome." Peter Hanns Reill and Ellen Judy Wilson, *Encyclopedia of the Enlightment*, Revised Edition (New York: Book Builders Inc., 2004) p.71 De Brosses also had a heated rivalry with Voltaire "...over payment for 40 cords of wood. The two men lived on adjoining estates in Burgundy … The dispute so angered Voltaire that he reputedly acted to ensure that the French Academy would not admit de Brosses into its membership." Ibid. De Brosses philosophy of language was also popular with it influencing Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot who was "the philosophe and reforming general controller of finances under Louis XV, [who] adapted material from de Brosses's treatise for his articles on language in the Encyclopedie."Ibid

[140] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.210

the mechanical structure of certain organs naturally makes them appropriate for naming certain classes of things of the same kind; … this leads ultimately to the fact that the objects included in this class have some quality or some movement which resembles that appropriate to the organ. It is therefore nature which is in charge here."[141]

Nietzsche questions de Brosses' assumption that there is a natural association of sounds to things and states "…such words are extremely remote from the origin of language; we have grown accustomed to the sounds and imagine that they contain some elements of things."[142] Through habit we have become accustomed to associate things together. Yet it is through habit that individuals associate different things together. This enables individuals from various cultures and societies to have different ideas. A discussion of habit is then remote from a discussion on the origin of language since de Brosses does not attempt to explain how these various associations have the same causal foundation. From this it cannot be argued that there is a natural association of sounds to names since this association transforms over time. Nietzsche gives an example of comparative linguistics to illustrate this point: "[which] immediately showed with clarity that the origin of language from the nature of things could not be proven."[143] Comparative linguistics compares meanings of words from different languages in order to construct its historical development. In this way, there are various causes and effects for how a sound forms the basis for the correct pronunciation of a word. This can be

[141] Charles de Brosses, Traité de la formation méchanique des langues et des principes physiques de l'étymologie [Treatise on the Mechanical Formulation of Languages, and the Physical Principles of Etymology] in Pieter Adrianus Verburg, *Language and its functions: a historico-critical study of views concerning the functions of language from the pre-humanistic philology of Orleans to the rationalistic philology of Bopp* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1998) p.391
[142] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.210
[143] Ibid

seen in Spike Gildea's modern linguistic study of Cariban language, an indigenous language from South America:

> In reconstructing the history of Cariban grammar … I began studying the Panare language [A Cariban language in southern Venezuela] … it was clear that a great deal of grammatical change had taken place somewhere to make Panare look so different from … [the] Carib of Surinam and Hixkaryana … when I gathered the available comparative data, I found exactly the predicted source constructions to be widespread throughout the family, and the anticipated further changes in a few languages. The existence of these comparative patterns constituted a reality check on the internal reconstruction … the comparative patterns disconfirmed some of my earlier hypothesis about Panare grammar, and by revealing source morphology and constructions which had been lost in modern Panare …[144]

Lord Monboddo and the divine ideogram as a foundation for language

Nietzsche notes that James Burnett, Lord Monboddo (1714-1799)[145] initially accepted the view that language is a human creation but ran into difficulties:

---

[144] Spike Gildea (ed.), *Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative linguistics and Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2000) pp. viii - ix

[145] James Burnett, Lord Monboddo was a jurist, scholar and anthropologist. As a scholar "Lord Monboddo was an enthusiastic admirer of ancient literature, and especially of the works of Plato, and other Grecian philosophers." Thomas Thomson, Daniel K. Sandford and Allan Cunningham, *The Popular Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, (Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1841) p.763 Monboddo was also an eccentric where "he seriously advocates the existence of satyrs and mermaids. [Depsite this] both his official and his private character were extremely respectable; and he was, notwithstanding his eccentricities, a man of learning and ability." Ibid His writing on language was also a precursor to evolutionary theory. As Tim Ingold explains "At the time the anthropoid apes were generally known as orang-utans … and nowadays denotes a particular species … Monboddo was firmly convinced that orang-utans were humans." Tim Ingold, 'Humanity and Animality' in Tim Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture and Social Life* (London: Routledge, 1994) p.20

"[Monboddo] accepts a reflexive activity of the mind: language is an invention of man … so man needs no primeval language. Monboddo wrote about his theory for twenty-one years: but the difficulties kept increasing. He ascribed the origin of language to the very wisest of men. Even then he still must resort to superhuman help: the Egyptian demon-kings."[146] Unlike de Brosses, for Monboddo there is no natural foundation for language since he argues that "… the faculty of speech is not the gift of nature to man, but, like many others, is acquired by him."[147] A natural foundation for language is rejected. This is due to Monboddo's acceptance of the Aristotelian premise that individuals are born with capacities, which are developed through habit and become a faculty for knowledge. In this way, language is not considered part of essential functioning of an individual's existence. As E.L. Cloyd explains "... from this [Monboddo] reasoned that as language was not essential to man's existence, as for example, the function of the senses is essential, language was not a natural power in man, but a faculty, for which man has some natural capacity. Thus he was led to reject one of the basic premises accepted by most of his fellow Scots, that language was one of the natural gifts bestowed on man by God."[148]

With no natural foundation, a problem for Monboddo's philosophy of language emerges. If language is not natural but acquired why did language need to develop at all? How did man originally arrive at the capacity or habit to acquire language as a faculty? An answer to this emerges through divine assistance:

---

[146] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.211

[147] Lord James Burnett Monboddo, *Of the Origin and progress of language*, Vol.1, 2nd Edition (Edinburgh: J. Balfour, 1774) p.12 http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=OctB-IVhyloC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 31st January 2012]

[148] E.L. Cloyd, *James Burnett Lord Monboddo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) p.64

> … a question will naturally occur …whether the invention of such an art does not exceed the faculties of man. And tho' I have no doubt that men, after the art is invented, may cultivate and improve it … [but] in the first discovery [of language] … men had a supernatural assistance; and therefore, I am much inclined to what the Egyptians tell us of a God … an intelligence superior to man, having first taught them the use of language: For the art of language was first practised in Egypt and from thence propagated all over the world.[149]

In contrast to his earlier thought, it was deduced that divine assistance was the only solution to the acquirement of language. Monboddo privileges ancient Egyptian civilisation, since it is thought to be the most developed system of language in the ancient world. This is illuminated by Cloyd's remarks:

> …demon kings, demi-gods gave the Egyptians the idea of language, which they then developed themselves … the Egyptian culture had progressed far enough to set aside certain men, priests, whose sole duty was the invention and development of the arts and sciences. These priests then made the language systematic, so that it could express all kinds of ideas with great flexibility and precision.[150]

For Nietzsche, Monboddo is unsuccessful in attempting to resolve a matter of the acquisition of language by arguing for a divine foundation based upon Ancient

[149] Lord James Burnett Monboddo, *Of the Origin and progress of language*, Vol.4 (Edinburgh: J. Balfour, 1787) pp. 184-5 http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=1pPMBJ6AopUC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 31st January 2012]
[150] E.L. Cloyd, *James Burnett Lord Monboddo,* p.168

Egyptian ideograms. This ultimately negates various forms of language and their different uses of expression. This can be seen in Qian Zhongshu's analysis of Monboddo's remarks on Chinese language. "[Monboddo] came to the conclusion that Chinese is 'the most extraordinary language in the world' being intermediate between a language of art and a barbarous language … [in resembling] the barbarous languages … it has neither composition, derivation nor flection."[151] This leads Monboddo to claim that even the Chinese language structure originated from the Ancient Egyptian language structure: "He praised the Egyptians at the expense of the Chinese, and, on the authority of 'a learned academician' … [who] affirmed that the Chinese have taken their written characters from Egypt."[152] We therefore see that in Nietzsche's view, by privileging Ancient Egyptian civilisation, Monboddo denies the possibility of different systems of language. Monboddo's false historical analysis allows for the presumption that all languages must follow the same structure. It also does not occur to Monboddo that the divine assistance could lead to a deception. This is because there is an assumption by Monboddo that the Ancient Egyptian Gods would always provide good assistance like the Christian God.

Herder and reflection upon expression as the foundation for language

Nietzsche initial remarks on Johann Gottfried Herder's (1744-1803)[153] essay is about his accomplishments but notes that Herder shares a dependence upon a

[151] Qian Zhongshu, 'China in the English literature of the Eighteenth Century' in Adrian Hsia (ed.), *The Vision of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998) p.145
[152] Ibid, p.146
[153] Herder's writings were immensely influential on Romantic period writers. This influence is explained by Michael N. Forster "… Hegel's philosophy … [extends] Herderian ideas … so too does Schleiermacher's [ideas] … Nietzsche is strongly influenced by Herder (concerning the mind, history, and morals) … J.S. Mill

transcendent foundation for language: "In Germany one hundred years ago the Berlin Academy had proposed a prize question … In 1770, Herder's book was selected. Man was born for language … But Herder shares with his predecessors the view that language is internalized from expressed sounds. He sees exclamation as the mother of language; whereas in actual fact the mother of language is negation."[154] In the *Essay on the Origin of Language* (1772), Herder makes the claim in its opening statement that "*Already as an animal, the human being has language*."[155] That is, we have a relation to animals through our tonal reaction to worldly sensations: "All animals, down to the mute fish, sound their sensations."[156] For instance, yawning when tired or screaming when in pain.

However, our ability to choose what to communicate enables human language to be distinguished from animals: "… no animal, not even the most perfect, has so much as the faintest beginning of a truly human language … refine and organize those outcries as much as you wish; if no reason is added … I do not see how … there can ever be a human language - a language of volitional speech."[157] In this way, animals remain limited to their use of language as being determined by reactions to things in their environment. This is because an animal's tonal expression is related to an instinctual drive: "the bee hums as it sucks; the bird sings as it nests."[158] In contrast, individuals can communicate delight or displeasure at the same sign (oh no, not dark

---

has important debts to Herder (in political philosophy); Goethe received his philosophical outlook from Herder…" Johann Gottfried Herder, *Philosophical Writings* ed. and trans. by Michael N. Forster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) p. vii

[154] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.211

[155] Johann Gottfried Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, ed. and trans. by Michael N. Forster (Cambridge University Press, 2002) p.65

[156] Johann Gottfried Herder, *Essay on the Origin of Language*, trans. Alexander Gode in *Two Essays On the Origin of Language; Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gottfried Herder*, ed. and. trans. by John H. Moran and Alexander Gode (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966) p.99

[157] Ibid

[158] Ibid

chocolate, oh yummy dark chocolate). Human communication then enables different reactions at signs whilst animals always communicate the same reaction.

Herder relates this distinction between human and animal language to the speech of new-born children: "how does man speak by nature? Not at all, just as he does little or nothing entirely by instinct, entirely as an animal … [the new-born child] expresses neither conceptions nor instinctive drives through sounds as any animal does in accordance with its species …"[159] A child can be said to mimic animal like tendencies at an early stage of development by only seeking to fulfil their basic needs. For instance, crying because they are hungry. However, a child's language must be distinguished from an animal's expression of tones since humans have the power of rational reflection. This reflection upon what to express enables freedom and independence from being solely determined by instinctual drives. "If man was not to be an instinctual animal, he had to be-by virtue of the more freely working positive power of his soul-a creature of reflection."[160] In this way, by reflecting upon what they want to express, children do not always react in the same way. A parent cannot always be certain that a baby or infant crying means that they want milk or food. Therefore reflecting upon which thoughts to express enables a freer relation of speech than in always communicating in order to express a reaction to a sensation. As Jürgen Trabant states "[the term reflection was used by Herder] to mean the cognitive disposition of human beings, the need of human beings to gain knowledge of the world … and this cognitive need – which is totally different from the animal need to communicate – creates thought that is simultaneously language."[161]

[159] Ibid, p.107
[160] Ibid, p.112
[161] Jürgen Trabant, 'Herder and Language' in *A Companion to the works of Johann Gottfried Herder*, ed. by Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (New York: Camden House, 2009) p.124

For Herder, it is through our ability to reflect upon an expression itself that creates language. This enables Herder to be distinguished from the Aristotelian tradition where language is defined according to external factors, our voice or material signs. As Trabant explains "…language is no longer *voice* or the material *sign* for the designation and communication of thought as in the traditional, Aristotelian view of language. Language is primarily *thought*."[162] By stating language is primarily thought, is for its expression to be an internal action created by reflection. In other words, language is dependent upon our internal capacity to reflect upon what to express and thereby is not detached or externalised from an individual. This enables Herder's philosophy of language to be distinguished from all others discussed so far as they depend upon an external source in order to validate it as language. The external source in Rousseau is the source of empathy required through the other individual, in de Brosses it is the body as a product of natural association of words, and in Monboddo, it is the Egyptian hieroglyphic.

This corresponds to Herder's initial thoughts on the origin of language made in *Fragments on Recent German Literature* (1766-67) where he makes the claim that human knowledge is dependent on language: "If it is true that we cannot think without thoughts, and learn to think through words, then language sets limits and outline for the whole of human cognition."[163] Language enables our thoughts to be expressed. By communicating our thoughts, individuals can learn and educate others. However, knowledge remains limited to what can be communicated and expressed. In other words, knowledge is defined according to given meanings that

[162] Ibid
[163] Johann Gottfried Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, p.49

we can understand. Andrew Bowie demonstrates this significance in relation to Kant's later attempt to identify the limit of knowledge in the *Critique of Pure Reason*: "Kant thinks the limits of human knowledge are dictated by the necessary mental forms in which it takes place. Before Kant even formulates his main ideas, Herder already suggests how these limits may be interpreted in terms of language as the condition of possibility of communicable knowledge."[164]

Nietzsche's criticism of Herder is related to the problem of the transcendent role of meaning. That is, Herder shares with his predecessors a search for the origin for language. This is in order to identify how communication is able to occur. This is why Nietzsche states that for Herder communication is the 'mother of language'. Yet Herder's answer is based upon the process of rational reflection. The process of reasoned deduction of what to communicate enables us to be distinguished from animals. Reason also then dictates the limits of knowledge based upon what can be communicated. From this, Herder's view of language is restrictive since all individuals have to reflect upon the same meaning. It is this same meaning that should be communicated in order for an individual's understanding to be correct. The role of meaning in Herder then is that it is based upon a transcendent sign that is devoid of any worldly qualities. This is in order for an individual to reflect upon the pure and absolute meaning that is attained through rational deduction.

In contrast, for Nietzsche, setting limits to our knowledge prevents differing opinions or perspectives from being formed. In other words, what is communicated is always open to the process of making sense. By having to make sense of the

[164] Andrew Bowie, *Introduction to German Philosophy: From Kant to Habermas* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003) P.51

communication, an individual's understanding is empirical. We relate names that are being communicated to given worldly objects. In doing so, names can never be abstracted or detached from the world. This enables individuals to form different opinions from their different cultural and social backgrounds. From this a critical remark can be made that a limit to our understanding is still applicable. A limit can still be applied according to the various different expressions of an idea. For instance, the expression of hello can be defined to the various expressions in different languages, konnichiwa in Japanese, bonjour in French, hallo in German and so forth. An answer to this criticism is that it does not take into account the process of making sense of an idea. It removes the worldly context and tonality in order for it to always express the same meaning. This enables a distinction to be made between Herder's and Nietzsche's views as Andrea Christian Bertino states "Herder and Nietzsche reflect on the interweavement of language, anthropology and history … the philosophy of history remains, for Herder, at the center [of understanding how ideas are formed], as is shown by the Ideas for the Philosophy of History of Humanity (1774-1791)."[165] In contrast, Nietzsche's philosophy rejects the privileged use of one discipline or technique over another. This is because of: "… his insistence on a critical use of historical knowledge fertile for a genealogical questioning of morality, religion, philosophy, and the myths of Modernity."[166]

By taking into account a worldly context and tonality we allow for meaning to be changed depending upon how an individual makes sense of the communication (X said hello whilst rushing in to work, Y said hello in a seductive manner, Z said

[165] Andrea Christian Bertino, 'As with Bees?' Notes on Instinct and Language in Nietzsche and Herder' in *Nietzsche on Instinct and Language*, ed. by João Constâncio and Maria João Mayer Branco (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011) p.7
[166] Ibid

hello loudly in order to get someone's attention). *A meaning is therefore is in continual state of becoming since it is always dependent upon how an individual makes sense of the communication.* Due to this, meaning, for Nietzsche, is never absolute (A is always B), conditional (A was true at time B but not now at C), or general (from differences of A, B, C, the general truth is D). Meaning is novel by being subject to a continual process of transforming in conjunction with an individual's process of making sense. Or to put it another way, there is any number of possible meanings that a word can be understood. Meaning remains dynamic by continually denying a foundation to be given. In this way, meaning is temporarily arrived at through our attainment of understanding but at the same time is able to be later changed when we return to it. This takes into account the novelty and fragility of meaning where we continually transform our prior understanding. The later perspective that we gain may be due to a reaction to contemporary events, responding to another's opinion, or reflecting upon what was said. The continual change of our understanding is a positive process that enables our thought to respond to contemporary problems.

Therefore for Nietzsche there cannot be a defined limit to our knowledge based upon communication since we must take into account the process of making sense in order to attain understanding. In this way, any limit remains in a continual state of becoming, as our knowledge is dynamic and in a state of transformation. Worldly forces (social, cultural, historical, political, environmental) continually affect an individual's understanding. These forces make our understanding dynamic as they remain in a state of continual flux. We thereby respond to these dynamic changes, which influence our opinion. For instance, in teaching a course over a

number of years the same material will be presented to students. Yet things happening in the world during their time reading the material will affect their understanding of it. In this way, a philosopher's concept is not simply repeated with the same meaning each year, rather, the concept's meaning is transformed by the different context in which it is repeatedly understood.

Following this, Nietzsche's philosophy of language is in contrast to the philosophers who have searched for an origin to language. He aims to reverse the notion that language is dependent upon transcendental signifiers such as God, man, reason or nature. This is to identify language itself as a dependent upon an individual's process of making sense. This shows an important early development for the later concept of transvaluation in Nietzsche's philosophy of language that seeks to reverse the transcendental signifier and replace it with values that affirm the world and the novelty of values. Nietzsche concludes the essay with a quote from Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling's *Historical-Critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology* (1842) who shares this different way of thinking about language, that is, individuals are not pure creators of meaning but our understanding is dependent upon and effected by worldly forces:

> … no philosophical consciousness, but … also no human consciousness at all is thinkable without language … yet, the deeper we inquire into language, the more definitely it becomes known that its depths exceed by far that of the most conscious product. It is with language as it is with organic beings; we

believe we see them blindly emerge into being and cannot deny the inscrutable intentionality of their formation, right up to the smallest detail.[167]

Rhetoric, Metaphor, and the denial of a pure origin

This conception of language is developed further in Nietzsche's *Description of Ancient Rhetoric* (1872-3) a series of notes that were delivered as lectures at Basel, to only two students. For Nietzsche, rhetoric is a critical tool that can be used to analyse the speech and writing of others, thus enabling us to become aware of their rhetorical techniques for hiding and furthering bias. This approach can also be applied to the analysis of claims for an absolute cause or origin. It is demonstrated that rhetoric is inseparable from such claims and that therefore a philosophy can never truly escape immanent processes. Nietzsche challenges the traditional philosophical role of rhetoric by drawing attention to its relation to bias. Once this link is established, the study of rhetoric assists in the denial of pure origins or transcendent foundations for meaning, because meaning is always a distortion.

Language is distorted since there is a multiplicity of possible interpretation of an expression: "we call an author, a book or a style 'rhetorical' when we observe a conscious application of artistic means of speaking … we consider it to be not natural, and as producing the impression of being done purposefully. Obviously, very much depends on the taste of the one who passes judgment …"[168] This is because rhetoric is dependent upon the speaker whose own personal preferences and bias affects their tonal emphasis. In Ancient Greek and Roman society, rhetoric was

[167] Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, *Historical-Critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology* trans. by Mason Richey and Markus Zisselsberger (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007) p.40
[168] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.21

inseparable from language itself. Due to the specific tonal expression on the speakers' bias, it was impossible for the writer recording the speech not to add their own sense of what was being said.

For Nietzsche, in contrast to antiquity, modern language assumes its own purity free from rhetorical distortion: "whereas our [modern] prose is always to be explained more from *writing*, and our style presents itself as something to be perceived through *reading*."[169] The writer can communicate clearly to the reader without the need for an interlocutor. Modern language thereby assumes that the writer's meaning can be clearly interpreted in its original sense by the reader. However, Nietzsche insists that modern language cannot be freed from rhetorical processes. This because rhetoric is a process working within language: "language itself is the result of purely rhetorical arts. The power to discover and to make operative that which works and impresses, with respect to each thing, a power which Aristotle calls rhetoric, is at the same time, the essence of language."[170] Briefly, for Aristotle, rhetoric was a valid art of communication because it allowed an individual to observe how an argument attempts to persuade its listeners into believing a truth: "[with] rhetoric we look upon as the power of observing the means of persuasion on almost any subject presented to us; and that is why … [rhetoric] is not concerned with any special or definite class of subjects."[171] Rhetoric enables us to precisely reflect upon those moments that the speaker places tonal emphasis upon. It is through this that the listener is able to identify the speaker's bias. The listener is therefore not simply an awaiting fanatical follower but rather a critical thinker who analyses the speech and is sceptical of its ideas.

[169] Ibid
[170] Ibid
[171] Ibid, p.7

Nietzsche accepts the Aristotelian view of rhetoric by remarking: “Language does not desire to instruct, but to convey to others a subjective impulse and its acceptance.”[172] For Nietzsche, rhetoric is also not an art of persuasion. It enables us to identify and analyse the process that persuades us into believing what is true. Nietzsche’s view of rhetoric can therefore be identified and distinguished from the general modern and classical approaches. This is because rhetorical processes affect both speaker and writer. In this way, there is no original meaning or intention to return to discover: “Man, who forms language, does not perceive things or events, but *impulses*: he does not communicate sensations, but merely copies of sensations.”[173]

The speaker or writer communicates only copies of truths. These copies of a truth are simulacra. Each copy is not a different form of the truth itself but a distortion of the truth. This is not to say truth itself cannot emerge, rather that, truth itself is distorted. There are no essential truths because a natural or original foundation is always prevented since rhetorical processes always underlie it. What is communicated is never knowledge but only an opinion: “Instead of the thing, the sensation takes in only a *sign*. That is the *first* aspect: *language is rhetoric*, because it desires to convey only a *doxa* [opinion], and not an *episteme* [knowledge]”[174]

Following these remarks, a critical point can be raised that Nietzsche arguing that we can never arrive at knowledge, or to put it another way, that we can never attain complete clarity for ourselves. This is because our knowledge is dependant

[172] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.21
[173] Ibid
[174] Ibid, p.23

upon the personal bias of someone else and so we can never truly think for ourselves. Should we not then adopt a rationalist methodology or empirical methodology that allows for think for ourselves and be free from being influenced by other views? We can be critical of any methodology that claims to be free from bias and enabling an individual to think for themselves. This is because, for Nietzsche, any philosophical method or concepts are inseparable from rhetoric. In other words, philosophers and philosophical methods are not free from seducing the reader into believing in their perspective and method as the best one. It is because of philosophy's relation to rhetoric that individuals are able to identify these processes. The identification of the specific emphasis placed on specific words enables us to critical of the text. In being critical of what is stated individuals think for themselves by not immediately agreeing with the argument[175].

The way in which rhetoricians persuade is through the use of images: "the sensation is presented externally through an image … It is not the things that pass over into consciousness, but the manner in which we stand towards them."[176] The speaker's personal bias affects the way in which an image is portrayed to the listener. This is to effect the listener's unconscious disposition towards the image used. The listener will then associate a particular idea towards specific worldly signs. It is through the association of ideas to signs that demonstrate the artistic aspect of rhetoric: "the *tropes*, the nonliteral significations, are considered to be the most

[175] From this we can see Nietzsche's influence on modern philosophical movement of deconstructionism and Derrida. As Simon Glendinning remarks "[For Derrida] it is not a matter of wanting to *deny* (or indeed of wanting to *affirm*) the correctness of our naïve, normal way of expressing ourselves … what [Derrida] develops in [Of Grammatology] is a 'theoretical matrix' that … [can] open the space for a new way of reading the philosophical heritage, its dominant structures and patterns of thinking, revealing its systematic dependence on … concepts like 'immediacy', 'proximity', and 'presence'. Simon Glendinning, *Derrida: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011) p.30

[176] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p. 23

artistic means of rhetoric ..."[177] Artists, like rhetoricians, do not simply seek to express worldly objects but their ideas. In other words, artists seek to express a general signification. For instance, Scottish poet Robert Burns' poem in *My Love is Like a Red, Red, Rose* (1794) proclaims, "my love is like a red, red, rose"[178]. What Burns seeks to express are not the various qualities (signifiers), its colours or botanical properties, but its general signification of temporality. Love is then temporal since, we our bodies can be compared to the life of flowers that will eventually decay and die.

The association of ideas to signs demonstrates for Nietzsche that all words are tropes: "… all words are tropes in themselves."[179] That is to say, there is no pure or absolute meaning for words. This is because associations change over time. Particular images will be transformed or fade over time as we make return to make sense of things. Due to this, an image that is associated to a particular sign becomes less expressive and fades over time: "[tropes] present a sound image, which fades away with time: language never expresses something completely but displays only a characteristic which appears to be prominent to it."[180] A particular association of an idea to a sign is not absolute since there is a multiplicity of ways to understand the sign. A particular association of an image then is temporal since it represents only one possible way to understand a sign. This enables us to understand various associations as influenced by their social and cultural forces in a specific time period. Ideas then lose their initial vivacity and their cultural and social impact over time. For instance, George A. Romero's *Night of the Living Dead* (1968) was shocking for its

[177] Ibid
[178] Robert Burns, 'My Love is a Red Red Rose' in *The Collected Poems of Robert Burns* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1994) p.318
[179] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p. 23
[180] Ibid

time, as Kim Paffenroth remarks "… it immediately attracted controversy for its scenes of graphic and unremitting horror, including zombies ravenously eating intestines … in close-up shots. Even more shocking was the scene of a zombie child eating her father and murdering her mother ... "[181] Today these scenes are not considered shocking with the popularity of zombie culture such as the television series of *The Walking Dead* regularly depicting violent scenes.

It is the second form of the *tropus*, the metaphor, that allows for new associations to be produced: "…it does not produce new words, but gives new meaning to them."[182] The distinction between first form trope*s* and second form trop*us* can be explained as follows. The first form, the tropes, is where certain characteristics of an idea fade over time. The second form, the tropus, allows for new characteristics of a sign to emerge. This demonstrates a dynamic connection between the two forms. Particular characteristics of a sign fade (tropes) whilst other characteristics are brought to light to replace them (tropus). Metaphors enable us to reflect on other possible characteristics of a sign. For instance, when a partner states 'he is the apple of my eye' it identifies a particular characteristic of being beloved. Whilst later they may state 'he is the light of my life' that identifies another characteristics of joy and happiness. This demonstrates that there is a multiplicity (simulacra) of characteristics that define an idea. Any definition of an idea therefore remains dynamic where any given associations are in flux.

The third form is the *metonymy*, the substitution of cause and effect. This is where the characteristics (the effects) and not the cause or absolute definition

[181] Kim Paffenroth, *Gospel of the Living Dead: George Romero's Visions of Hell on Earth* (Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006) p.27
[182] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p. 23

constitutes a name: "when the rhetorician says 'perspiration' for 'work,' 'tongue' for 'language'"[183]. This is to criticise a rationalist view of language where different understandings and perspectives of a name are negated in preference to a general signification (I am a cogito). In contrast, for Nietzsche, the various senses that constitute a name cannot be related to the same meaning. Or to put it another way, a multiplicity of senses transform the relationship to its meaning in each expression.

This is because each understanding of a sign is singular and unique. An understanding therefore does not repeat the general signification but creates its own unique form. For instance, an individual can attempt to categorise different shades of colours and say that they all share quality. Yet this categorisation of colour negates each unique shade. Instead of categorising them into sharing the same quality of colour, each colour itself transforms the way in which we understand the general signified. This is to recognise different senses for themselves in order for them to maintain the contrasting ways they express knowledge. In doing so, the multiplicities themselves deny an original foundation or essence to knowledge. As Céline Denat states "Nietzsche's argumentation … consists in showing that the terms which we call 'proper' or 'natural' are only said to be so in as much as a long habit has made them *seem* to be so … Hence, what appears to be artificial or rhetorical in a given linguistic, historical and cultural context could end up seeming quite different in another one."[184] We should then question what is natural or our own habits in order to return to an experiential foundation for language: "… the belief in a proper language and in its real differentiation from an improper language is the effect of

[183] Ibid, p.25
[184] Céline Denat, ''To Speak in Images': The Status of Rhetoric and Metaphor in Nietzsche's New Language' in *As The Spider Spins: Essays on Nietzsche's Critique and Use of Language*, ed. by João Constâncio and Maria João Mayer Branco (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012) p.18

having forgotten the history and developmental nature of language, as well as of our 'taste' for certain modes of expression rather than others."[185]

Therefore Nietzsche has defined language's inseparable relation to rhetoric through three connected forms of simulacra: The tropus, tropes and metonymy. Or to put it another way: the fading of knowledge, the selection of new characteristics that revitalise concepts and the denial of an original cause. Paul de Man further explains this significance "[Nietzsche's work on rhetoric] marks a full reversal of the established priorities which traditionally root the authority of the language in its adequation to an extralinguistic referent or meaning, rather than in the intralinguistic resources of figures."[186] This shows a difference in Nietzsche's philosophy of language to his predecessors' search for the origin of language. For his predecessors there was a necessity of finding a transcendent category: Rousseau's emotional gesture, de Brosses' natural association, Monboddo's divine ideogram and Herder's reflective thought. A transcendent category of language was necessary for each of their philosophies as it explained how humanity acquired language. However, this emphasis on a transcendent category negates differences within languages. The transcendent category assumes a universal linguistic where each individual would not have a contrasting sense of things, share the same meanings and collectively all share the same experiences. In contrast, Nietzsche's philosophy of language shows that each individual has a unique sense of things (tropus). This unique sense is developed through an image that is not eternal but fades over time. Through expressing their sense, it transforms the given category of things where it given a new meaning (tropes). This denies an original foundation to language

[185] Ibid
[186] Paul de Man, *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1979) p.106

(metonymy) since an individual's sense always transforms due to their continual apprenticeship. Nietzsche's philosophy of language therefore does not seek to find an origin but to show how that origin itself is part of an inseparable process of rhetoric.

The determination of sense by social convention and its absurdity

As we have seen Nietzsche's use of rhetoric takes into account the immanent processes that form given philosophical truths and values. By taking these processes into account the traditional philosophical model is challenged. This model is challenged by not attempting to discover a pure transcendent foundation for language but rather, to demonstrate how any claim for an absolute cause is based upon the worldly forces that play a part in creating it. Nietzsche's use of rhetoric as a critical tool is not limited to philosophical concepts, origins or causes but also allows us to critical of norms in society and culture. Once we have become aware of and identify bias we become skeptical of the accepted values or truths that are given to us. This is because it allows us to take into other opinions and viewpoints, rather than, solely accepting one.

By challenging the accepted social and cultural norms we then begin the process of thinking for ourselves. In other words, we begin the process of making-sense of it and rediscovering what it means. However, the use of rhetoric and critical thinking then leads to an alienation from its values. As we have seen in the introduction, Locke avoids this problem of alienation by an individual's acceptance and conformity to the general use of names. In contrast, Nietzsche affirms this alienation as a positive process that allows us to remain skeptical and to think for ourselves. Yet this

process is an unending process since his later concepts of the overman, revaluation and the eternal return that is discussed are ways of constructing an alternative philosophical model based upon immanence, and at the same time, allowing for the reader to arrive at their own meaning having undergone an existential style of crisis.

Far from affirming an individual's unique perspective, language remains determined by the choices of the masses: "language is created by the individual speech artist, but it is determined by the fact that taste of the many makes choices … a figure [of speech] which finds no buyer becomes an error. An error that is accepted by some *usus* [custom] or other becomes a figure [of speech]."[187] An individual's perspective must find followers in order for it to become accepted by society. In other words, a perspective must have a use value. By accepting a perspective other individual's give it greater value. In giving a specific view enough value it will become accepted as a general view by society. However, those individuals who do not find followers to accept their view are considered as in error and their view is forgotten. The relation of society's values and error is discussed further in Nietzsche's essay *On Truth and Lying in an Extra-Moral Sense* (1873):

> [An] individual wants to preserve himself against other individuals … but at the same time, because man, out of necessity and boredom, wants to live socially in the herd, he needs a peace agreement … [this] leads to the first step towards man's acquisition of his mysterious desire for truth. For what 'truth' will be from now on is fixed; a uniformly valid and binding terminology for

[187] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.25

> things is invented and the legislation of language also enacts the first laws of truth.[188]

An agreement is made by an individual in order to accept a country's social and cultural values. By accepting these values an individual is no longer an outsider but is able to be accepted by society. The consequence of accepting these values is the negation of an individual's unique perspective. This perspective must be negated in order to be equal and fit in with others in society: "man also wants truth in a similar, restricted sense … he is indifferent to pure, inconsequential knowledge; toward truths which are perhaps even damaging and destructive, he is hostile."[189] Any perspective that differs from what is generally accepted by society is treated as hostile, damaging and destructive to the status quo. Or to put it another way, any truths that attempt to challenge social norms are invalidated. This is to say, at a deeper philosophical level; to be part of society is to accept a herd mentality, a perspective that is agreed upon by society as correct. In this way, individuals no longer seek to make sense of the world for themselves but conform to generally accepted values. This is because an individual's perspective has less use value than the social norm. In order to be correct and have greater value the perspective must conform its truths[190].

[188] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.247
[189] Ibid, p.248
[190] The film *Logan's Run*, dir. Michael Anderson (Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1976) is a good example to illuminate Nietzsche's point. In the film there is a belief in the truth that an individual must die when they become 30. The main character Logan played by Michael York discovers the absurdity in this idea. He attempts to show others that individual's do not have to die at 30 but can lead a fulfilling life beyond the age limit. Nietzsche is also demonstrating that dogmatic belief in general truths is absurd where different senses must be affirmed to overturn a generality.

For Nietzsche, complete obedience to generally accepted values is also to deceive oneself into believing a falsity as the truth: "… only by hardening and rigidification of the mass of images that originally gushed forth ... only by the invincible belief that *this* sun*, this* window, this table is a truth-in-itself, in short, only insofar as man forgets himself as a subject, indeed as an *artistically creative subject*, does he live with some calm, security and consistency."[191] The problem is that by denying a unique perspective is also to deny the creative force to transform how we understand the world. Nietzsche explains that a denial of rhetorical processes, the identification of bias and words as metaphors, has led us to forget about other possible valuations: "[an individual] thus forgets that the original intuitive metaphors *are* indeed metaphors and takes them for the things themselves."[192] As Linda L. Williams explains "Nietzsche argues that language is a convention, wholly non-natural, which stresses similarities over differences in its invention of words, nouns especially. Because language ignores individual differences and concentrates on gross similarities, words other than proper nouns operate as a kind of shorthand, or economy for human experience."[193]

That is, one specific perspective is then given so much value that we always associate it to signs. Yet this general association is false since there are other perspectives that challenge it. For instance, Copernicus (1473-1543) who is famous for the heliocentric view (the planets revolved around the sun and not the earth) was mislabelled as a priest. As Edwards Rosen states "… Copernicus, the founder of modern astronomy, never called himself a priest throughout the seventy years of his

[191] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.252
[192] Ibid
[193] Linda L. Williams, *Nietzsche's Mirror: The World as Will to Power* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001) p.79

life. Neither his friends, nor his enemies … his close associates nor his distant acquaintances, ever referred to him as a priest."[194] The reason for this mislabelling was due to Galileo: "The falsification 'Copernicus the priest' was invented by Galileo while he was embroiled in his bitter and tragic struggle with the Roman Catholic Church."[195]

Following this criticism of general truths, does this mean that Nietzsche is affirming the life of a hermit rather than being accepted and living in society? Nietzsche is not arguing that individuals should exclude themselves from society; rather, individuals should be active members in society in order to show the absurdity in general truths by analysing the underlying rhetorical emphasis. In doing so, the social norm is debased and shown to be erroneous. This enables individuals to reflect upon the idea of truth as a perspective, one among many that is overburdened with value. As Williams states "Nietzsche's point seems to be not that we must abandon these kind of [philosophical] concepts [such as God or Reason] but that we must recognize that such designations arise from within us and not from the external world …"[196] There is not then a pure for foundation or origin for Truth since it "… arises from particular humans beings, from perhaps their very physiology and not from any conscious decision to create it, then an independent, nonarbitarary foundation for Truth is a fiction invented by us."[197]

The process of debasing social norms claims for truth can be related to Nietzsche's later philosophical work *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (1883-5). In the

[194] Edwards Rosen, *Copernicus and his Successors* ed. by Erna Hilfstein (London: Hambledon Press, 1995) p.47
[195] Ibid, p.48
[196] Linda L. Williams, *Nietzsche's Mirror: The World as Will to Power*, p.85
[197] Ibid, p.86

Prologue, Zarathustra descends from the mountains after ten years have passed to teach his philosophy. The philosophy that Zarathustra teaches is that of the Übermensch or Overman, which is sometimes translated as Superman:

> *I teach you the Superman*. Man is something that should be overcome. All creatures hitherto have created something beyond themselves: and do you want to be the ebb of this great tide, and return to the animals rather than overcome man? What is the ape to men? And just so shall man be to the Superman: a laughing stock or a painful embarrassment … The Superman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: The Superman shall be the meaning of the earth![198]

After this prophetic speech the people listening at the marketplace mock and laugh at the idea of a Superman. The mockery of the philosophical concept by the people of the marketplace cannot be understated. This is because Nietzsche is demonstrating the problems in philosophical concepts' practical value for society. In order to have worth, philosophical concepts affect social norms. By affecting social norms individuals are then left open to question their values and preconceptions for how they had understood the world. This enables an individual to be seduced by the philosopher's concepts since their philosophy offers the correct way to understand the world. The irony of philosophical concepts is evident, unlike social norms that have a relation to a country and civilisation; they are based upon metaphysical foundation. In other words, an individual must become an apprentice to a metaphysical system that will enable them to more correctly understand the world.

[198] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* trans. by R. J. Hollingdale (London: Penguin, 2003) pp.41-2

Nietzsche's concept of the Superman is a humorous mockery of this philosophical view. In other words, we can view the Superman as the achievement of reason by reflecting upon a pure version of our self (such as the Cartesian cogito). In order to attain a correct understanding of ourselves we must accept a metaphysical view. This is because we are able to clearly define who we are, rather than, attempting to define ourselves based upon experiential effects (I am cold, I am hot) or the novel changes in our personality over time (I used to like A, B, C but now like D, E, F). At the same time, Nietzsche insists that we should be critical of this traditional emphasis on a metaphysical self in order to affirm experience and life itself: "…*remain true to the earth*, and do not believe those who speak to you of superterrestrial hopes … They are despisers of life, atrophying and self-poisoned men, of whom the earth is weary: so let them be gone!"[199]

For Deleuze Nietzsche's Overman or higher man addresses this nihilism by making us reflect upon the reactive nature of thought: "to what extent is man essentially reactive? … Nietzsche presents the triumph of reactive forces as something essential to man and history."[200] That is, to react is a positive reaction since it addresses a problem that arises. This takes place within a worldly context and its resolution will have a positive effect on various areas of life. For instance, whether tuition fees should be paid requires a positive reaction in order to resolve the problem. Its resolution will then have an effect upon the impact of social, cultural, and political impact upon whether people will be able to afford, or receive funding for their education. The problem is that this aspect of reacting has taken by becoming focused upon the transcendent: "Nietzsche speaks of the masters as a type of

[199] Ibid, p.42
[200] Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson (London: Continuum, 2006) p.157

human being that the slave has merely conquered, of culture as a human species activity that reactive forces have simply diverted from its course, of the free and sovereign individual as the human product of this activity that the reactive man has only deformed."[201] We must then not think of a reaction in terms of a dialectical division but as part of a process of forces: "what constitutes man and his world is not only a particular type of force, but a mode of becoming of forces in general, not reactive forces in particular, but the becoming-reactive of all forces."[202] By taking into account various affective forces we can then return to a focus upon the worldly context and the positive effect our reaction takes, rather than, focusing upon one particular force above others or a move away from these forces completely.

Nietzsche then sought to invent concepts that emphasised a life affirming philosophy rather than attempting to deny it through transcendental concepts. In relation to the Overman, individuals must rediscover themselves as creative forces that have the capability to positively transform the way they think. The way in which Nietzsche demonstrated this was through the rhetorical technique of *aposiopesis*. As David B. Allison explains "… there is no 'essential' property [of the overman] to *describe* … nor …does the overman appear even once in the whole of *Zarathustra*. Thus, it is left up to the reader to fill in what the 'characteristics' of the overman might be."[203] This technique is adopted so that:

> The reader is forced to draw a conclusion … one that is left unstated by the author, but seems implied by contextual circumstances … its strength is that

[201] Ibid
[202] Ibid, p.158
[203] David B. Allison, *Reading the New Nietzsche: The Birth of Tragedy, The Gay Science, Thus spoke Zarathustra, and On the Genealogy of Morals* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2001) p.118

> the reader or interlocutor feels he has come to his own conclusion –quite literally- in his own terms and in function of his own judgment, thereby personalising his understanding of what the author may, or may not, have intended.[204]

It is therefore arriving at an understanding of values for one self that enables a word to be revaluated. It is through the process of continually revaluating words that the worldly forces that influence a given conception are affirmed: "Every word becomes a concept as soon as it is supposed to serve not merely as a reminder of the unique, absolutely individualized original experience … but at the same time to fit countless, more or less similar cases, which, strictly speaking, are never identical, and hence absolutely dissimilar."[205] That is, once a word becomes a concept it becomes part of a generalised and accepted usage for the term. Yet at the same time, each time the word is applied it does not fit the general category. For instance, the concept of a white cat assumes a perfectly white feline. However, this term is inadequate when trying to apply the term white cat to various instances we find in our experience. There might be a white cat with a black tail, or with brown spots and so forth. Each time we encounter these various instances of white cats this then forces us to continually make sense and revaluate the category. By revaluating the category we continually affirm the worldly forces that challenge our previous association. Nietzsche emphasises this importance in his last work, *Ecce Homo* (1888): "To be able to look out from the optic of sickness towards *healthier* concepts and values … if I became a master of anything, it was this. I have a hand for switching

[204] Ibid
[205] Nietzsche, *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, p.249

perspectives: the first reason why a 'revaluation of all values' was possible, perhaps for me - alone."[206]

The consequences of not being able to challenge accepted views or revaluate understanding is illuminated in another of Nietzsche's concepts, the eternal return, developed in his later philosophy which describes the necessity of the revaluation for language. One of Nietzsche's most famous statements about the eternal return is from *The Gay Science* (1882):

> What, if some day or night a demon were to steal after you into your loneliest loneliness and say to you: 'This life as you now live it and have lived it, you will have to live it once more and innumerable times more … there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought will have to return to you, all in the same succession and sequence.[207]

The eternal return is a repetition of the same. This is for an individual to continually repeat the same events in their life forever. No differences or newness would ever emerge since it can only be repeated exactly the same way. For Deleuze the eternal causes an individual to reflect on events in their life and how they could have been unfolded differently, thereby demonstrating the necessity of new values and difference. This is reflected through an affirmation of novelty: "… the eternal return is … the result of the dicethrow, the affirmation of necessity which brings together all parts of chance. But it is also … the repetition of the dicethrow, the reproduction and

[206] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings* ed. by Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman, trans. by Judith Norman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) p.76
[207] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* trans. by Walter Kaufman (New York: Vintage Books, 1974) p.273

reaffirmation of chance itself."[208] The eternal return is an affirmation of chance due to the continual return of novelty. For instance, this can be seen in the continual different experience of driving to work. One day we get stuck behind traffic, another day someone cuts you off, and another your favorite song comes on the radio. As Deleuze notes, traditionally these novelties and differences are denied within philosophy. This is because of the precedence of transcendent causes: "chaos and cycle, becoming and being have often been brought together, but as if they were opposites … there is no chaos in the cycle, the cycle expresses the forced submission of becoming to an external law."[209]

In this way, each given multiplicity is not seen as unique but rather expresses part of a unity or whole. Deleuze gives the example of Plato's philosophy where "becoming is itself an unlimited becoming, a becoming insane, a becoming hubric and guilty which, in order [to gain control over] needs the act of a demiurge who forcibly bends it, who imposes the model of the idea on it."[210] In order to attain understanding and knowledge a model must be placed upon multiplicity. For instance, if we attempted to state what is red? Then we are presented with various examples, ruby, crimson, blood red and so forth. However, we are not lead to a clear and definitive answer but rather examples of red. If then we asked again what is red? More examples could be given which results in a set of endless examples would any clarity having been attained. In order to attain understanding, Plato uses the model of the Idea. This is where various multiplicities reflect the same Idea. In this way, crimson, ruby and blood red are not completely unique since they all reflect the same idea of redness.

[208] Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.26
[209] Ibid, pp.26-7
[210] Ibid

For Deleuze, Nietzsche does not adhere to the traditional model where multiplicity reflects a unity or whole: “Nietzsche does not recognize his idea of eternal return in his predecessors of antiquity. They did not see in the eternal return the being of becoming … that is to say the necessary number, the necessary result of all chance. They saw it as the opposite, a subjugation of becoming, an avowal of its injustice and the expiation of this injustice.”[211] Chance and novelty is then to be viewed not as a detriment to knowledge but is productive since it allows us to continually revaluate and challenge our own ideas. For instance, in encountering an artwork such as Jackson Pollock’s usage of dripping paint enables us to challenge the traditional role of the brushes in art. Yet this challenge does not have to be based upon general methods since Deleuze and Nietzsche make us continually reflect upon the subtle changes that we can continually make. This would be to take into account the artist’s continually different usage of techniques and his or her modification of those techniques as problems are encountered.

Therefore knowledge is not to be based upon a transcendent foundation due to the complete denial of novelty. Nor is knowledge to be based upon a transcendental foundation since transcendental categories also deny these novelties through their generalization. For Deleuze and Nietzsche, it is only an immanent foundation to knowledge that can truly affirm novelty and the dicethrow. This is to affirm the continual dissatisfaction that we have in continually remodeling our ideas. For instance, this positive destruction can be seen in the continual revaluation of what a day is like. One day is boring, another depressing, another filled with a miracle.

[211] Ibid, p.27

The relation between eternal return and transvaluation is captured in a note from 1884 during the composition of *Zarathustra*:

> 1059 (1884)
>
> 1. The idea [of the eternal recurrence]: the presuppositions that would have to be true if it were true. Its consequences.
>
> 2. As the hardest idea: its probable effect if it were not prevented, i.e., if all values were not revalued.
>
> 3. Means of enduring it: the revaluation of all values. No longer joy in certainty but uncertainty; no longer 'cause and effect' but the continually creative; no longer will to preservation but to power; no longer the humble expression, 'everything is merely subjective,' but "it is also our work! - Let us be proud of it![212]

Through the eternal return Nietzsche forces readers into contemplating the dread of having a continuation of the same values. Each belief would be dogmatically affirmed without an opportunity for it to be refuted. This would lead to a reaction against a revaluation of all values since the belief in a given value would overpower contrasting values. As George David Miller states "Assuming that values are at the core of the human enterprise, we may say that our incompleteness as human beings refers to the incompleteness of values. Denial of transvaluation amounts to denial of

[212] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, ed. by Walter Kaufmann, trans. by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Vintage Books, 1968) p.545

the human project. To be a seeker of truth, transvaluation is imperative…"[213] This negative effect on language can be seen in the Enlightenment period when Scottish phrases were corrected into 'proper' English equivalent. Scottish writers became aware that it was necessary that their ideas were communicated clearly so it could make sense to another reader so there could be established a wider readership. As Joan Beal states "Although the most pressing concern was with 'correct' pronunciation, respected authors such as David Hume and James Beattie were sufficiently concerned about their written English to compile their own lists of such Scotticisms as should be avoided."[214] The purpose of these lists of Scotticisms was "…[to] eradicate such features from the written language of educated Scots."[215] This demonstrates the destructive feature of value where in denying rhetorical difference destroys language itself. This is because language must compare itself to an ideality that cannot compare to it. In contrast, Nietzsche argues words cannot eternally retain the same value. Values must change in order for there to be progress in ideas and to show the flaw in a dominant value. This can be seen in the continuation of the Scottish language which did not fully conform to an English standard: "…Scots continued in use in informal, and particularly spoken, registers even among the educated upper and middle classes, and the eighteenth century saw a revival of poetry in Scots."[216] The continuation of the Scottish language showed that it had its own separate and different values from the English language. This enabled a revaluation the concept of Scotticism from being a negative use of the English language into a positive use of language itself.

---

[213] George David Miller, *Negotiating Toward Truth: The Extinction of Teachers and Students* (Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998) p.82
[214] Joan Beal, 'Syntax and Morphology' in Charles Jones (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Scots language* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997) p.337
[215] Ibid, p.338
[216] Ibid

A way in which a positive transformation of language occurs where difference was to be affirmed can be seen in a modern example of revaluation through the transformation of the image of thought of an African American in the 20th Century. As Thomas E. Carney explains "The major issue facing African Americans in the twentieth century was segregation, set in place by the Jim Crow laws [established after the Civil War] and validated by the Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896."[217] It was only through the Civil Rights movement (1955-1968) and by figures such as Martin Luther King Jr. and the later speeches of Malcolm X that enabled a transvaluation of the image of thought. This revaluation showed the vicious way the racism was implemented through society and the absurdity of still treating another individual like a slave. As Heather Adamson explains "the [civil rights] movement inched along, one lunch counter at a time, one sports team at a time. One school. One store. One town."[218] This struggle eventually enabled several bills to be passed such as "The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 gave African Americans equal chances at jobs and housing."[219] Despite these changes "life is still not equal for all Americans. But the United States continues a commitment to change thanks to the civil rights movement."[220]

Conclusion

[217] Thomas E. Carney, 'Baptist Church, African Americans And. Social Assistance' in Paul Finkelman (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of African American History 1896 to present: from the Age of Segregation to the Twenty-first century*, Volume 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) p.133
[218] Heather Adamson, *The Civil Rights Movement: An Interactive History Adventure* (Minnesota: Capstone Press) p.101
[219] Ibid, p.104
[220] Ibid, p.105

Revaluation therefore takes place through a suppression of difference. This is for an individual to realise the necessity of difference through an eternal return of the same value. The same values attempt to consume and establish a universal image of thought through the correct use of language or correct image of thought. Yet for Nietzsche this realisation of an eternal return of the same is a rhetorical process. This is because an individual becomes aware of rhetorical processes that work through a value. A value is not pure or transcendent but is part of several different competing forces that attempt to be the overall truth. In this way, values do not retain an eternal power but fade over time. Just as the impact of a certain idea was shocking there is a loss of its intensity and vivacity over time (as can be seen with the initial shock at Darwin's theory of evolution and its modern acceptance). Values are also not dependent on certain people but their apprenticeship to language. This is to take away the individual as the centre of all choices, in other words to decentre the subject. This is to say, a choice remains subject to rhetorical processes. A choice cannot be determined by pure cause or causal origin since it is determined through historical and social influences.

An individual or subject's choice is then based upon the unconscious processes and forces that form part of the reason for our conscious actions. However, this is not solely to focus upon the unconscious processes of their mind but rather upon those based within the world. It is to take into account the novel occurrences within the world that have an effect upon us. For instance, we could see this in adopting a particular lifestyle choice. By adopting a certain lifestyle individuals will have to continually take into account different occurrences on an everyday basis that force them to reflect upon their choice. Individuals choosing a healthy lifestyle will heavily

scrutinise the meal choices that are made. They will make concessions at times to allow for “non-healthy” snacks and continually adapt their health plan in order to be one that works for them. From this we can see that for Nietzsche and also for Deleuze’s philosophy the role of individual is not secondary to the unconscious or to processes and forces. The individual or subject plays an important complementary role in the adoption of social and cultural roles. This adoption is to become an apprentice in learning roles. Yet our performance of these roles demonstrates the novelty of the everyday and the fragility of the social and cultural norm that is enforced.

Nietzsche’s concept of apprenticeship then differs greatly from Locke. In Locke the aim of an apprenticeship is for an individual’s understanding to conform to the social norm. This allows for other individuals to understand what is being expressed. It also allows for an educational system where correctness is based upon agreeing with the generally accepted truth. For Nietzsche, the aim of an apprenticeship is for an individual to demonstrate that a generally accepted truth is based upon a burdened perspective. It is through an analysis of its historical and social context that reveals that there are other competing claims. Or to put it another way, a multiplicity of other senses in which it could be understood. The apprenticeship is therefore to reveal these processes that influence the creation of concepts and structures of knowledge. By revealing these processes at work an individual affirms worldly forces in order for all individuals to revaluate their understanding of the world. In doing so, we are presented with a challenge to make sense of things for our self is to be alienated from society. However, this is a risk

worth taking as it enables us be free from deception, think for ourselves and open up to different possible ways to view the world.

The next chapter continues to develop the concept of sense in relation to a Hegelian understanding from a reading of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* and the *Science of Logic*. This will enable an important connection to a child-like understanding of the world that will be returned in Chapter 6's discussion of Alice's apprenticeship in Logic of Sense. This analysis will also enable the important concept of difference to be developed in relation to Deleuze's philosophy. Recent academic analysis has focus upon the Deleuze's interpretation of Hegel based around his understanding of difference. Two alternative views of Stephen Houlgate and Slavoj Zizek are given in order to demonstrate both sides of this argument. Houlgate presents Deleuze's interpretation of Hegel as a misreading of the concept of inherent difference. Whilst Zizek's affirms Deleuze's reading since both of their philosophies adhere to the same ideas of inherent different. The aim of the next chapter then will be to present an alternative view that Deleuze does not seek to affirm a philosophy of pure becoming or pure difference. My reading of Deleuze's analysis of Max Stirner's concept of the unique Ego will be used to demonstrate this point. It will be argued that Deleuze's position is between Hegel's and Stirner's one that affirms structure and at the same time, also affirms the unique understanding of each individual.

2

Deleuze's Hegel: Negation and the Revaluation of Dialectics

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I demonstrated how Nietzsche challenged various transcendent claims for an origin for language. This is because worldly forces and process are inseparable from our ideas and the creation of philosophical concepts. Nietzsche's project then is based upon the importance of the empirical process of making sense. As Deleuze states: "Nietzsche's most general project is the introduction of the concepts of sense and value into philosophy."[221] Nietzsche introduces the concepts of sense and value into philosophy in order to challenge the role of ideal metaphysical structures in German Idealism. This is to argue that an ideal structure is revealed through rational reflection upon immediate experiential objects. From an idealist view knowledge is not gained through our immediate engagement with the world, but rather, through reflection upon the mind's rational framework. Nietzsche viewed this philosophical movement as nihilistic. This is because the emphasis on an idealist foundation negates the importance of bodies, actions, and the world. As Karen Leslie Carr explains "Nihilism [in Nietzsche's philosophy] is used to describe particular negating, life-denying interpretations of the world … the absence of any meaningful interpretation of the world, usually due to the

[221] Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson (London: Continuum, 2006) p.1

collapse of the prevailing interpretation … [and] the multiplicity of possible interpretations all deemed equally false."[222]

For Nietzsche, the ideal qualities that we reflect upon are not metaphysical or detached from the world, but rather, ideals that are valued by a society. Our knowledge then conforms to socially accepted ideals and norms. The problem with this acceptance of social norms is the denial of other possible perspectives. By denying other viewpoints we become passive, in the acceptance of herd-mentality. In this subdued form, individuals blindly accept others' opinions as true without calling them into question. Nietzsche then challenges us to become philosophical in order for individuals to be critical and call into question the validity of truth claims. *In this way, we must no longer take truths at face value but must make sense of things for ourselves in order to attain knowledge*. By challenging the values of society we demonstrate the timeliness of truth. In other words, the ideal values that are privileged are based upon correct knowledge at a given time. This challenge to values then allows us to come to the realisation that our knowledge of truth is not based upon an absolute foundation but an uncertain one. It remains uncertain since there always remains a possibility that this knowledge will be incorrect or later disproven.

Nietzsche's philosophical project then challenges the image of thought presented by traditional philosophy. That is, our knowledge is based upon unchanging and eternal truths. In contrast, for Nietzsche, knowledge is dynamic, transformative and transient. With this focus on a dynamic basis Nietzsche called for

[222] Karen Leslie Carr, *The Banalization of Nihilism: Twentieth Century Responses to Nihilism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992) pp.27-8

individuals to revaluate all values. In philosophical terms, we must revaluate transcendent claims. The revaluation of these claims then demonstrates their timeliness. More importantly, the demonstration of a timely foundation enables us to identify the contemporary problem that the metaphysical concept aimed to resolve. In this way, worldly forces (cultural, social, historical and so forth) influence the creation of a concept. Although a claim made in his later philosophy, Nietzsche's process of revaluation can already be identified in the previous chapter's discussion of the origin of language. Nietzsche revaluates various causal claims, Rousseau's empathetic gesture, de Brosses' establishment of a natural origin to language, Lord Monboddo's divine origin and Herder's origin based on thought. Each answer attempted to establish itself as an absolute value by providing the definitive origin of language.

The problem with Nietzsche's critical analysis of philosophical structure is that it devalues claims to meaning. That is, by having a metaphysical foundation for our knowledge we allow individuals to arrive at certainty and clarity. To be sceptical of this foundation is to arrive at an affirmation of our experiential relation to the world. Yet at the same time, we affirm a multiplicity of possible truths and not an absolute truth. By doing so, our knowledge becomes uncertain and distorted. Arthur Danto confirms this nihilistic view, as he states: "Nietzsche's philosophy is a sustained attempt to work out the reasons for and the consequences of Nihilism."[223] This is because, for Danto, Nietzsche denies the possibility of arriving at both empirical and rational truth. As Richard Schacht comments"[Danto's view of Nietzsche ascribes to the view that] nothing true can be said about reality, or (more narrowly) … that there

[223] Arthur C. Danto, *Nietzsche As Philosopher: Expanded Edition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013) p.16

are no objectively valid axiological principles."[224] In this way, the metaphysical move made by philosophy is necessary since it enables us to arrive at meaning. It is then Nietzsche's non-traditional philosophy that is nihilistic by having no structure. Deleuze further illuminates this problem in Nietzsche's project: "Previously life was deprecated from the height of higher values, it was denied in the name of these values. Here, on the contrary, only life remains, but it is still a deprecated life which now continues stripped of meaning and purpose, sliding ever further towards its nothingness."[225] Nietzsche's project of revaluation then becomes an act of futility that reaffirms the philosophical move to the transcendental.

We are then presented with two contrasting philosophical approaches. Either, we must support an empirical perspective that demonstrates the importance of our experiential relation to the world; or a rationalist view that aims to establish a metaphysical foundation in order for individuals to be able to arrive at stable meaning. The problem in both cases is the problem is nihilism. From an empirical view is that the rationalist's emphasis upon transcendent concepts is nihilistic since it detaches us from the importance our experiential relation to the world. The benefit of an empirical approach is the enrichment and diversity of our ideas. Other perspectives also enable a critical analysis of our view where our own views can be challenged, as well as, the capacity to recognise flaws in another individual's argument. From the rationalist view, we cannot arrive at meaning or certainty by affirming a multiplicity of different opinions. In doing so, an empirical approach is nihilistic by being unable to arrive at meaning. The benefit of a rationalist approach is the resolution of conflicts and arguments. This is because we all share the same

[224] Richard Schacht, *Making Sense of Nietzsche: Reflections Timely and Untimely*, (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1995) p.35
[225] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.140

capacity to reason. By rationally reflecting upon differences in our opinion, similarities and comparable qualities begin to emerge. Through the use of reason we can agree upon the same universal principles regardless of our social, cultural background or our time periods.

It appears from Deleuze's analysis of Hegel that he agrees with an empirical approach. As he remarks: "Spinoza or Nietzsche are philosophers whose critical and destructive powers are without equal, but this power always springs from affirmation, from joy, from a cult of affirmation, from the exigency of life against those who would mutilate and mortify it. For me, this is philosophy itself."[226] By adopting an empirical approach we affirm our experience, and the worldly forces that influence our thoughts. Deleuze's image of Hegelian philosophy presents a stark contrast: "… what is philosophy incarnated in Hegel is the enterprise to 'burden' life … to reconcile life with the State and religion, to inscribe death in life - the monstrous enterprise to submit life to negativity, the enterprise of resentment and unhappy consciousness."[227] In adopting a rationalist approach we negate various perspectives and worldly influences in order to arrive at the same universal principle. Yet, in doing so, we deny the importance of our experience and worldly processes.

This chapter will analyse the empirical and rational tension in *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. An analysis of Hegel's *Phenomenology* enables me to develop further the importance of the process of making sense. It is an outline of Hegel's concept of sense that enables the concept of conceptual difference to be established. Put simply, in order to arrive at knowledge we must negate our immediate understanding

[226] Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts*, ed. by David Lapoujade, trans. by Michael Taormina (London: Semiotext(e), 2004) p.144
[227] Ibid

in order to reflect upon its absent qualities. By reflecting on the absent qualities we are able to identify conceptual differences. These conceptual differences provide a structure for our experiential knowledge by clearly defining and differentiating objects. It is in different justifications of the importance of being able to attain meaning through rational reflection that two contrasting images of Deleuze's interpretation of Hegel emerge. Stephen Houlgate draws upon Deleuze's empiricism in order to problematize the attainment of meaning. This is because without conceptual difference we are left with only understanding but no knowledge. In other words, we are restricted to a purely sensory engagement with the world without language or communication. Slavoj Zizek presents us with an alternative image of a Deleuze who precisely agrees with Hegel's conceptual difference. Deleuze and Hegel's philosophies then share the same rational grounding. I challenge Zizek's purely rationalist view by drawing upon Deleuze's empiricism through his brief analysis of Max Stirner.

For Deleuze, Stirner enables us to reflect upon the negation of novelty that occurs in the dialectical process. In affirming novelty, Stirner creates the alternative concept of non-conceptual difference. In philosophical terms, Stirner's concept of uniqueness, the unique ego, creates a metaphysics of pure difference. Difference cannot be actualised since it is no longer truly unique. It will then be argued in contrast to Houlgate's view that Deleuze aims to affirm both Hegel and Stirner's positions. In choosing an either/or alternative we separate the process of making sense and meaning (either a child-like world or an ordered world). Deleuze affirms both the process of sense and the attainment of meaning. Structure and methodologies are essential in allowing us to understand the world. Yet we our

practical application and empirical process of making sense is also necessary. We are then presented with a mobile structure, a Frankenstein, whose parts are added to and transformed through each individual's process of making sense (a child's creative play with structures, continually rebuilding their Legos).

Hegel, Sense and Negation

Hegel's concept of sense is developed in *The Phenomenology of the Mind* (1807). Our initial knowledge is gained through our immediate experience of the world. Our immediate experience is a child-like interaction with the world. Comparable to Locke's view in the *Essay*, the world is blank, without language and meaning. Due to this relation and importance of experience, Robert Stern notes commentators have contrasting opinions as to what school of thought that Hegel initially discussed: "For some interpreters, the motivation behind sense-certainty is a commitment to epistemic foundationalism, which posits direct intuitive experience as giving us the kind of unshakeable hook-up to the world on which knowledge is built."[228] Others disagree with this epistemic foundationalism approach seeing it rather as "… a commitment to empiricism, according to which intuitive knowledge is prior to conceptual knowledge, because empirical concepts are learned and get their meaning by being linked to objects as they are given in experience."[229] Following this, there are a third set of commentators who argue that "… it is a commitment to realism, which holds that if the mind is not to distort or create the world, it needs to be in a position to gain access to the world in a passive manner without the

[228] Robert Stern, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hegel and the Phenomenology of Spirit* (London: Routledge, 2002) p.44
[229] Ibid

meditation of conceptual activity, so the kind of direct experience envisaged by sense-certainty must be fundamental."[230]

In contrast to the adoption a specific school of thought or style of thought Stern notes "[there is] a deeper assumption here that is really Hegel's more fundamental concern. This is the assumption that because it does not use concepts, sense-certainty is in a position to grasp a thing as an individual, without any abstraction from its unique specificity or pure particularity and that in doing so sense certainty gives us the most important kind of knowledge, which is of things as concrete singular entities."[231] Stern's point is then that that the certainty and meaning that is attained through sense-making takes importance over the particular methodological style. This is because the priority is for an individual to arrive at his or her own unique singular understanding of an object: "sense-certainty prioritizes the one-to-one relation of direct experience over the generality and abstractness of thought, and so treats apprehension as more fundamental than comprehension."[232] For Stern then the focus is then based upon an ontological foundation, with the focus upon how objects in the world reflect the individuality of our own understanding: "Hegel emphasizes that for sense-certainty it is the individuality of the object that is taken to be ontologically fundamental."[233]

For Hegel, we begin to make sense and understand objects through our sensory engagement: "the knowledge or knowing which is at the start or is immediately our object, cannot be anything else but immediate knowledge itself … we must alter

[230] Ibid
[231] Ibid
[232] Ibid
[233] Ibid, p.45

nothing in the object as it presents itself. In *ap*prehending it, we must refrain from trying to *com*prehend it."[234] That is, an object in its immediate impression is in a child like state of sense making. In this child like state we can understand its various sensual qualities. As Peter Singer remarks "[when our] consciousness has front of it what we would describe as a ripe tomato, it cannot describe its experience as a tomato, for that would be to classify what it sees. It cannot even describe the experience as one of seeing something round and red, for these terms too presuppose some form of classification."[235] In the process of making sense, we are able to apprehend an object's qualities (it's hot, cold, squidgy, hard and so forth.) Yet we remain unable to fully comprehend it since we are unable to know exactly what the object is (I do not know that bouncy, round, red object is a ball). It is then through the process of naming that we attain knowledge (the thing that provides hot and cold sensations is a called a water tap.)

Following this, Hegel problematizes the empirical process of naming. This is because our experiential world is in a state of continual transformation. Any definition that would be given would always be in a prior state of change in the actual object. Any empirical definition would then never be able to adequately describe the world. In order to illuminate this point, Hegel attempts to define arrive at a definition of Now: "To the question: 'What is Now?, let us answer, e.g. 'Now is Night' … we write down this truth [in an attempt to preserve it] if *now*, this [we observe has, in fact, has transformed to] *noon* … [then] we shall have to say that it has become stale."[236] An empirical definition of Now fails since it must continually be altered according to the

[234] Georg W. F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit* trans. A.V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977) p.58
[235] Peter Singer, *Hegel: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) p.70
[236] G. W. F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p.60

time of the day. From this, we can identify for Hegel that an empirical definition only remains temporarily true. At a specific point, it was night, but this is no longer true, it is now noon.

For Hegel, we can arrive at a correct definition by reflecting upon the absence of qualities in the actual object. In philosophical terms, we reflect not upon the immediate object present to our senses, but rather, the mediated object. This is to rationally reflect upon the general qualities that differentiate each object. By reflecting upon these differences, we can arrive at a clear definition. This is because we reflect upon an object's universal properties. These properties will always remain the same over time: "A simple thing of this kind which *is* through negation, which is neither This nor That … such a thing we call a universal. So it is in fact the universal that is the true [content] of sense-certainty."[237] It is from this basis of that we can attain to a certain and clear definition of Now: "The Now that is Night is preserved … but as something that is *not* Night … in other words, as a negative in general. This self-preserving Now is … not immediate but mediated."[238] This is because we are to reflect upon its general qualities and separate Now into either daytime or night time. Following this, we can define their universal qualities, night as darkness with an absence of sunlight. We can also define daytime, bright with an absence of moonlight.

With Hegel's emphasis upon communicating an ideal and not actual objects, a criticism can be raised. This is because we are still faced with the problem of being unable to express the actual object. Comparable to Leibniz, we cannot seem to

[237] Ibid
[238] Ibid

accurately represent actual object in language. Or in Hegelian terms, the world is immediate whilst language is always mediated. Hegel's response to this problem is that language is a direct expression of an actual object:

> It is a universal too that we *utter* what the sensuous [content] is … we do not envisage the universal This or Being in general, but we *utter* the universal; in other words, we do not strictly say what in this sense-certainty we mean to say. But language … [is] more truthful; in it, we ourselves directly refute what we mean to say … language expresses this true [content] alone.[239]

The process of rational reflection enables us to reflect upon the correct understanding of our experiential world. When we then communicate we express, the mediated object, the true representation of the object. The dualism between ideality and actuality is then removed since *the mediated Idea enables us to attain knowledge by reflection upon a defined universal property.* This arrival at the universal property then enables us to conceptually define objects. As Jean Hyppolite notes the opening chapters of the *Phenomenology* is for us to arrive at the concept:: "we could … summarize the three chapters on consciousness – sensuous certainty, perception, understanding- by saying that for us, but only for us, the object of consciousness comes to be what Hegel calls the 'concept' (*Begriff*,) which is nothing other than the subject, that which is only by virtue of self-development, opposing itself to itself, and rediscovering itself in that opposition."[240] However, it must be noted, that Hegel does not deny that we cannot be conscious of specificity or the uniqueness of things, as Stephen Houlgate remarks, "The result of Hegel's analysis

[239] Ibid
[240] Jean Hyppolite, *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. by Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974) p.80

is not … that we can never be conscious of specific things."[241] The problem is then that the specific qualities of the object is denied in sense-certainty by the lack of being able to clearly define its unique properties: "The specificity of things eludes sense-certainty because it refuses to identify them explicitly, but thinks of each purely as *this, here, now*. And it does that because it thinks that, in so doing, it will have in view the undiluted immediacy of the thing."[242] Yet far from being able to affirm its uniqueness we are left in a completely indeterminate state being unable to clearly communicate its differences: "Sense-certainty's concern for *immediacy* is thus what consigns it to utter *indeterminacy*."[243]

It is through communication that we are able to share our knowledge with others, as Jim Vernon states "Because we have no immediate access to the minds of others, we require a medium through which we can inter-subjectively share our experience with others. This medium, Hegel claims, is language. Language arises as an inter-subjective medium employed to demonstrate the objectivity of our (determining forms of) experience."[244] Language is the means in which we can test with others if we have correctly understood an Idea, or in Hegelian terms, if we have been able to use our reason correctly to reflect upon the qualities that the immediate object is lacking. In contrast to Locke's *Essay*, we should remove ourselves from our social and cultural usage of language. In doing so, greater objectivity is achieved about a given Idea: "We must abstract from lived language, without abstracting from language itself, for it is in the latter that our ideas (start to) gain objectivity. By examining language outside of [everyday] use, we can come to know what if any

[241] Stephen Houlgate, *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: A Reader's Guide* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013) p.34
[242] Ibid
[243] Ibid
[244] Jim Vernon, *Hegel's Philosophy of Language* (London: Continuum, 2007) pp.2-3

universals can be expressed through it."[245] For instance, we can reflect upon the same-shared meaning in different languages such as goodbye in English, au revoir in French or auf Widersehen in German. Or in relation to philosophy, we must challenge our immediate understanding of a concept. This is necessary in order to understand the philosopher's sense of it. Through reflecting upon its meaning we are led to a more profound meaning. It is through understanding this concept that we can slowly discover the structure to the philosophy.

For Vernon, we can arrive at a Hegelian philosophy of language through its syntactical structure. This is because all language adheres to syntax in order for our ideas to be understood: "… isolated words, without associations or senses – *what Hegel calls names as such* … these senseless words form the material through which a truly universal form of content-determination can be demonstrated … thus the syntactic form that underlies all language is immanent to it, and not the contingent imposition of thinking upon it."[246] Following this, even if a radical approach were taken in order to speak complete nonsense, an individual's sentence would not be understood but still adhere to syntax. A famous example of this is Noam Chomsky's nonsensical sentence colourless green clouds sleep furiously. A fuller discussion of Chomsky's philosophy of language will be made in the next chapter. At present it is sufficient to state that for Chomsky, through syntax we arrive at understanding of the underlying deep structure of language. This deep structure is revealed by the mind through its capacity to associate abstract concepts such as goodness to actual objects.

[245] Ibid p.14
[246] Ibid

Therefore, for Hegel, we arrive at knowledge of the world through understanding the mind. It is the mind that enables us to provide structure to our sensory experience. From this we can see the move from a chaotic, unstable and transitory empirical basis to an immutable, stable and eternal foundation. A Hegelian apprenticeship is then a process of rational reflection upon the structures of the world. However, it must be stressed that to have knowledge of these structures is not to eventually arrive at an absolute, complete or God like understanding of the world, as Deleuze remarks: "How 'arrogant' someone will say, to act like God and grant yourself absolute knowledge. But we have to understand what being is with respect to the given … the world refers to being not as the essence beyond appearances, and not as a second world which would be the world of the Intelligible, but *as the sense of this world*."[247]

Hegel is opposed to a pure metaphysics (such as the Platonic forms) where everything worldly is devalued according to higher values (the soul's devaluation of the body). Hegel's Ideal structures are not abstract since they are created through making sense of given objects. Or in philosophical terms, the mediate can only be created by reflection upon an object that is immediately present to our consciousness: "In the empirical and in the absolute, it is the same being and same thought; but the empirical, external difference of thought has given way to the difference which is identical to Being, to the internal difference of Being..."[248] That is, the empirical differences enable us to reflect upon their general qualities. This general quality is the internal difference or the mediated Idea. What is lost through the creation of the Ideal are the novel differences (sky blue, baby blue, royal blue are

[247] Deleuze, *Desert Islands*, p.16 - added italics
[248] Ibid, p.17

all unique shades). These are the singular qualities that are negated altogether. In this way, in making sense of a given object there is loss of ability to be dissimilar and unique. As Deleuze states "… absolute knowledge is in effect distinct from empirical knowledge, but only at the cost of denying the knowledge of non-different essence."[249] There is a cost to attain knowledge, namely, the denial of these singular and unique differences that is apparent in our experience. Yet, for Hegel, this is price worth paying if it means that we can arrive at clarity, certainty and knowledge.

Deleuze's problem with Hegel's negation of immediacy

We can relate Deleuze to Hegel's concept of sense in his review of Jean Hyppolite's *Logic and Existence* (1953). This is because it in this review that Deleuze is concerned with the role of sense and the negation of novelty in Hegel's epistemology: "Being can be identical to difference only insofar as difference is taken to the absolute, in other words, all the way to contradiction … The thing contradicts itself because, distinguishing itself from all that is not, it finds its being in this very difference; it reflects itself only by reflecting itself in the other, since the other is *its* other."[250] For Deleuze, each experiential object is singular and unique. The generalisation of these qualities then negates their singularity. In this way, Hegel only compares general differences (black is not white, white is not black), its ideal qualities and not actual objects, which are incomparable (liquorice black is not onyx black). This radical concept of difference is later echoed in *Difference and Repetition* (1968): "Repetition is not generality. Repetition and generality must be distinguished in several ways. Every formula which implies their confusion is regrettable."[251]

[249] Ibid
[250] Ibid, p.18
[251] Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. by Paul Patton (London: Continuum, 2004) p.1

If we repeat general qualities we can reproduce an idea. For instance, if I drew a yellow circular object then other individuals would understand it as the sun. Yet what is lost is the novel way in which these qualities would be drawn. The artist's the ability to express of each singular quality is negated in preference to its general representation (The uniqueness of each of Van Gogh's flowers negated as sunflowers in a vase.) Therefore, in order to know Hegelian philosophy negation is based upon *the external* experiential object. An object then differs from another based upon comparison. We reflect upon its ideal qualities, stripping it of any novelty and uniqueness in order to knowledge of its general properties.

For Deleuze, another form of negation can be identified in Hegel's *Science of Logic* (1812-16) that is inherent to a given object. This conflict separates the *Logic* from the earlier *Phenomenology*: "This supposes that in the very least that the moments of *Phenomenology* and the moments of *Logic* are not moments in the same sense, but also that there are two ways, phenomenological and logical, to contradict oneself."[252] This is because in logic an individual does reflect upon an immediate experiential object but rather, its ideal properties. It is then the task to prove if these ideal properties can be practically applied to every instance (2+2=4 can be applied to every object in the world). For Deleuze, what is lost in the use of an ideal method such as mathematics is the loss of the account of variables in our experience. For instance, a scientific experiment produces a median that generalises the variables from the data that was gathered. Yet this median number has the possibility of transforms if a larger set of data was gathered. If this data is later

[252] Deleuze, *Desert Islands*, p.18

disproven through repeating the experiment, one set of general data replaces another. Therefore for Deleuze, in both the *Phenomenology* and the *Logic* what we must return to is our initial process of making sense. As we shall see that Deleuze seeks to reverse this dialectical structure, from negation to knowledge to multiplicity and negation. This enables us to affirm the initial and immediate experiential engagement with the world that is otherwise negated by Hegel. In doing so, we affirm these uniqueness of expression but also the necessity of attaining definition and structure to our knowledge.

Deleuze's critical reading of Hegel's concept of difference has been itself criticized by contemporary Hegelian scholar, Stephen Houlgate. For Houlgate, Deleuze misreads Hegel's concept of difference. This is because of complex nature of difference in Hegel's philosophy. It begins from an external difference based upon subjectivity, where difference is based upon subjective preference. This allows for a multiplicity of various opinions of the same idea. The subjective model then moves to one based upon internal difference. That is to say, an object has inherent differences that make it unique from another. These qualities are universal and allow us to arrive at a clear and concise understanding of it. Houlgate's view of Deleuze problematizes his view of difference as based upon a distortion of meaning by allowing for a multiplicity of meanings. Therefore for Houlgate the model of internal or inherent difference then must adhered to in order for meaning and clarity to be established.

In contrast to Houlgate's view, Slavoj Zizek, another contemporary philosopher and Hegel scholar, argues that Deleuze's view of difference is identical to that of Hegel's view of inherent difference. Zizek's own project in *Organs Without*

Bodies then attempts to draw out these similarities within Deleuze and Hegel's philosophies. In opposition to both Houlgate and Zizek, my view is that Deleuze's critical reading of Hegel seeks to address the deeper philosophical problem of the dialectical structure. This problem is the negation of immediacy and multiplicity in preference to idealism and sameness. However, this is not to affirm a subjective philosophy or one based upon pure difference. I argue Deleuze's philosophy and view of dialectics seeks to affirm both multiplicity and structure.

Houlgate on Deleuze: negation is inherent and not external

For Stephen Houlgate in *Hegel, Nietzsche, And The Criticism of Metaphysics* (1986), it is Deleuze's sympathies with Nietzsche that lead to a misreading of Hegel's concept of difference. Houlgate highlights that Hegel's philosophy is influential for other readers who sympathise with Nietzsche's argument such as R. J. Hollingdale: "In Hollingdale's view, Hegel is the last major representative of that tradition of Western philosophy which finds its most incisive critic in Nietzsche."[253] However, in Houlgate's view, Deleuze is the example par excellence of those who completely disregard Hegel's influence upon Nietzsche's philosophy: "The most celebrated advocate of Nietzsche's critique of Hegel is Gilles Deleuze … In Deleuze's view … there can be no question of a compromise between Nietzsche and Hegel. [To such an extent that] Nietzsche's philosophy is 'an absolute anti-dialectics'."[254] By interpreting with a complete Nietzschean bias Deleuze's reading of Hegel's

[253] Stephen Houlgate, *Hegel, Nietzsche and the Criticism of Metaphysics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) p.5
[254] Ibid

philosophy remains completely unrecognisable: "[Deleuze's] view of Hegel … is a distortion."[255]

Houlgate highlights Deleuze's use of the concept of negation within Hegel's philosophy as an example of this bastardisation: "For Deleuze, negation is always either a denial of already qualitatively specified forces, or the secondary consequence of the self-affirmation of already qualitatively specified forces. It is never conceived as that which specifies and differentiates such 'forces' in the first place."[256] In Houlgate's reading of Deleuze, negation is either based upon a denial of already predefined objects in the world (what I see does not have A, B or C qualities) or reaffirms their experiential qualities (a white cat is not a black dog). In this way, we never reflect upon the ideal structure, or in Hegelian terms, move from the immediate to the mediate. We remain within experience, the immediate, through association. Either through the association of qualities that we perceive or in the ideas that are reflected upon.

For Houlgate, negation is not an empirical act but based upon the subject's external negation. This is because we arrive at an abstract ideas that are detached from the actual object: "… If we are predominantly negative beings, we begin with the external negation of existing forces and derive an abstract notion of selfhood by a conceptual dialectical process."[257] Houlgate here illustrates that based upon an empirical view of negation we affirm different subjective ideas of a given object (A's Idea of X differs from Y's and Z's). We then arrive at a different idea of what the object *is for us*, *rather than reflect upon the ideal structure of the actual object*. For

[255] Ibid, p.7
[256] Ibid
[257] Ibid

Houlgate, this is why "… negation for Hegel is not something brought to bear on a positive premise from the outside, but is inherent in that premise from the start. According to Hegel's *Science of Logic*, a thing must be *in itself* the negation of something else if it is to have any determinate characteristics – and indeed be differentiated from anything else – at all."[258]

A distinction must then be made from external and inherent negation. This is because negation is an internal process within a given object where we reflect upon *a predefined meaning*. An object will then always possess the *same* qualities that enable it to be differentiated from another (blue is never red). Individuals are then able to reflect upon the same rational structure that underlies our experience: "… if on the other hand, we are predominately affirmative beings, then we begin with the affirmation of ourselves and of what differentiates us from other forces, and conclude with a negative evaluation of certain of those forces."[259] From the use of rational reflection, we then move from subjective disagreement and to consensus, or from conflict to harmony. In philosophical terms, this demonstrates the dialectical structure of Hegel's philosophy of the move between thesis and anti-thesis to synthesis. Following this, Houlgate implicitly agrees with Jean Hyppolite's view of negation in *Logic and Existence*, it is not two separate forms of negation in the *Phenomenology* and the *Logic* but a consistent one. In both works, it is the same rational structure of the world that is emphasised, and at the same the inseparability of it from the world (we always reflect upon the experiential object and practically apply a logical method).

[258] Ibid
[259] Ibid

By arriving at knowledge, and not a series of different opinions, negation is a positive process that leads us to meaning. Deleuze's Nietzschean bias only views negation as external process in order to affirm a multiplicity of different opinions: "Deleuze will not acknowledge that negation is inherent in affirmation as Hegel does. Instead he insists that negation is either a quality … distinct from affirmation or merely a subordinate consequence of affirmative premises."[260] For Houlgate, as we cannot arrive at consensus or knowledge, Deleuze's understanding of Hegel leads to a form of anarchism since it is impossible for meaning to be established: "what are the consequences of Deleuze's failure to appreciate Hegel … a great deal, because it means that for Deleuze there is no qualitative identity between affirmative and negative modes of being … a further consequence … is that selfhood for him is conceived in an asocial, virtually anarchic way."[261]

Zizek's Deleuze: inherent negation is difference in both Hegel and Deleuze

Slavoj Zizek shares Houlgate's view that Deleuze misinterpreted Hegel's view of negation. As he remarks in *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences*: "If ever there was a straw-man, it is Deleuze's Hegel: is not Hegel's basic insight precisely that every external opposition is grounded in the thing's immanent self-opposition, i.e. that every external difference implies self-difference? A finite being differs from other (finite) things because it is not already identical with itself."[262] Comparable to Houlgate's view, Zizek also states that negation is not externally applied by an individual but is intrinsic to the object itself. It is based upon this misreading of Hegel in Houlgate's view there is no value whatsoever in Deleuze's

[260] Ibid
[261] Ibid
[262] Slavoj Zizek, *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences* (London: Routledge, 2012) p.x

reading. However, for Zizek, Deleuze also holds Hegel's view of internal negation. Throughout each of Deleuze's work on philosophers he attempts to discover positive elements within even philosophies that he disliked: "Besides Hegel, there are three philosophers who are obviously hated by Deleuze: Plato, Descartes and Kant … in all three cases, Deleuze tries to enter the enemy's territory and twist, for his own ends, the very philosopher who should be his greatest enemy."[263]

In Zizek's view, Deleuze did not need to produce any work on Hegel. In other words, Deleuze did not have to discover a positive element within Hegel's philosophy since their views on negation are comparable: "Hegel is the absolute exception – as if this conception is constitutive … this would mean that, in an unacknowledged way, Hegel is uncannily close to Deleuze."[264] Zizek then seeks to provide a close reading of their philosophies in order to demonstrate how two seemingly opposed views emerge in a mutual relationship: "…why should we not risk … the practice of the *Hegelian buggery of Deleuze*? … How would the offspring of *this* immaculate conception look like? … What if … Hegel is the greatest self-buggerer in the history of philosophy?"[265]

Following this, in Houlgate and Zizek's view of Deleuze there is an emphasis on devaluation and revaluation. If we agree with Houlgate then Deleuze's reading of Hegel must be dismissed completely. On the other hand, if we agree with Zizek's view, then a revaluation of Deleuze and Hegel's relationship can be made. Both views emphasise the role of Nietzsche, in Houlgate's view, Deleuze's Nietzschean bias clouds his interpretation of negation. Or for Zizek's, Nietzsche's philosophy was

[263] Slavoj Zizek, *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences* (London: Routledge, 2004) p.46
[264] Ibid, p.48
[265] Ibid

able to be ‘twisted’ but Hegel’s philosophy remained unique as it was impenetrable due to the mutual relationship shared between their philosophies. In both cases Hegel’s philosophy takes precedence over any interpretation that can be made by Deleuze. His brief reading is therefore a ‘distortion’ or a ‘straw man’ where the Hegel’s concept of internal negation replaces Deleuze’s concern for the negation of novelty.

This enables us to return to Deleuze’s epistemological concern with the dialectical method: the negation of the process of sense by meaning. From the view of internal negation, the process of education is then to repeat predefined meanings. From this model, the emergence of unique styles and techniques are denied in preference to the established model. For instance, if a fanatical Jimi Hendrix fan taught guitar, his or her students would be continually reprimanded for not adhering to the same style. This would deny the student the possibility of learning other styles and techniques. This would also deny, more importantly, their own style of playing Hendrix that differed from their teacher’s. Therefore, I do not agree with Houlgate’s view that Deleuze is an anti-dialectician, but rather, he seeks to revaluate the role of immediacy in the dialectical method. In this way, Deleuze has not misinterpreted Hegel since he wants to transform the traditional understanding of negation to an affirmation of immediacy.

For Deleuze, we can affirm of the role of immediacy and the process of making sense through revaluation: “… the point of transmutation or transvaluation: negation loses its own power, it becomes active, it is now only the mode of the

powers of affirming."[266] This is because through the process revaluating we debase the claim for an original meaning or absolute value. In philosophical terms, the ideal qualities of a structure is challenged by demonstrating its reliance upon worldly forces (social, cultural, environmental, and so forth.) For instance, in the evaluation of an antique we place an initial, and sometimes an unreasonably high, value upon an object. A professional evaluation by an antique dealer challenges our valuation through an examination of the quality of the object and its maker's history. If the object is in bad condition but was of a limited production with a renowned maker then it could be extremely valuable. If, on the other hand, that the object was of part of a large production then the value may be considerably less than what we had in mind.

It is then through a historical evaluation that we can challenge an idealistic expectation and values that we place upon objects. In this way, negation becomes a positive force by calling into question our ideal expectation or bias. In the same way, we can apply the process of revaluation to the Jimi Hendrix fanatic by discussing Hendrix's influences from history. This would demonstrate that the creation of one's own style is dependant upon a variation of techniques. Their idolisation and personal bias is then challenged through a demonstrating the multiplicity of influences upon the creation of an individual's own style. A discussion of Deleuze's later philosophy of difference in *Difference and Repetition* is made in Chapter 5. At present, for Deleuze, we can see negation is an affirmation of not only our experience but also our own unique understanding of the world. In other words, the negation of an opinion or methodology is a positive action since it allows for views and predispositions to be challenged. In challenging these views and predispositions we

[266] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.187

can then affirm the novel process of and unique way in which an individual transforms a given methodology in order for it to respond to a given problem.

A connection then can be made with Hegel's philosophy based upon the problem of identity, as Henry Somers-Hall remarks "… both Hegel and Deleuze develop their philosophies from a common problematic, which Deleuze calls finite representation … In Deleuzian terms, it is a multiplicity made up of elements that remain indifferent to their relations, or at the least, pre-exist the relations between them."[267] In Hegelian terms, this is to challenge our immediate empirical understanding by moving towards understanding of its rational structure. This allows all individuals to reflect upon the same universal ideas and arrive at consensus. In contrast, Deleuze seeks a metaphysics based upon pure difference (each understanding is unique). Comparable to Leibniz's view, this is where we our empirical understanding, through generalisation, fails to adequately express the singularity of the world.

Given my current description of revaluation, do I fall prey to at Houlgate's problem of anarchism? In other words, is Deleuze's view that we should never arrive at consensus since all values, methods and perspectives are affirmed? Or is Deleuze's philosophy dualistic in nature, in a manner comparable to Peter Hallward's view of his philosophy, where a virtual sense can never be actualised. It is through Deleuze's reading of Max Stirner's concept of the Ego that the problem of language and dualism will be illuminated. This reading challenges views of dualism, anarchism and a popular characterisation of Deleuze's philosophy as destructive of structures. I

[267] Henry Somers-Hall, *Hegel, Deleuze and the Critique of Representation: Dialectics of Negation and Difference* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2012) pp.2-3

will show that this image is flawed. The problem for Deleuze is, rather, that how can we affirm unique understanding whilst at the same time, affirming general structure? In philosophical terms, we must challenge Stirner's view of non-conceptual difference and affirm the use of concepts, methods and their revaluation.

Stirner: the Ego, uniqueness and the problem of names

In Stirner's *The Ego and Its Own* (1845) the history of philosophy is summarised by transcendent concepts and structures that determine an individual's action: "What is not supposed to be my concern! First and foremost the good cause, then God's causes, the cause of mankind, of truth, of freedom, of humanity, of justice, further, the cause of my people, my prince, my fatherland; even finally the cause of my mind and a thousand other causes."[268] Traditionally in philosophy individuals must define their knowledge, ethical and moral judgment and political actions according to a teleological end. As Pierre Hadot remarks: "… there is no discourse that deserves to be called philosophical if it is separated from philosophical life, and there is no philosophical life unless it is directly linked to discourse."[269] Philosophy provides us with a metaphysical structure. This structure provides us with a guide or method for living our life. This enables us to positively change our attitude: "we can define philosophical discourse as a spiritual exercise - in other words, as a practical method intended to carry out a radical change in our being ... thereby transforming one's vision of the world and one's own inner attitude."[270] By rationally reflecting upon our actions, we can recognise the potential harm that we could cause to others and

[268] Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*, ed. by David Leopold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) p.5
[269] Pierre Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, trans. Michael Chase (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004) p.174
[270] Ibid, pp.176-8

ourselves. Rational reflection also allows us arrive at clarity of understanding. In order to live a good life our actions then must adhere to the attainment of achieving a teleological end.

For Stirner, we may appear to be doing good actions but we always act in our own personal interest and gain. Stirner therefore implicitly suggests a Machiavellian nature of selfish goal achievement. In philosophical terms, individuals will use any number of means to achieve the same end. Those who are successful in achieving this end will be masters of deception. For instance, Juliette a prostitute, in Marquis de Sade's *The Misfortunes of Virtue* pretends to love a nobleman and marries him. He arranges for her to inherit his estate and wealth if he should die. With a title and wealth Juliette is then able to erase her history of living in a brothel, along with, her husband: "… to have a name and be rid of all chains, dared yield to the culpable notion of abridging her husband's life … she conceived her plan and, executed it with such stealth that she was able both to elude the arm of the law and to bury all traces of her abominable crime along with her hindrance of a husband."[271]

A critical response to Stirner is that metaphysical structure is positive since it enables us to overcome our own selfish desires and to think of others. In relation to Christianity, there is the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37). This teaches us to help others regardless of race, religion or background. By helping another individual, we move from our desires and interests towards charity, selflessness, and compassion. According to a Stirnerian response to the Christian act of helping one's neighbour the act cannot be seen without the benefit the

[271] Marquis de Sade, *The Misfortunes of Virtue and Other Early Tales*, trans. by David Coward (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) p.8

Samaritan hoped to achieve. The parable is an answer to the question given to Christ "what must I do to inherit eternal life?" (Luke 10:25) The parable teaches an individual to commit good actions in order to be rewarded in the afterlife. From this, we can see that the act of helping another is negated through the benefits that they sought to achieve in the afterlife. We no longer help another individual human being because we care for them, but rather, we performed it for our own personal wellbeing. Therefore the charity, selflessness and compassion shown by the Samaritan is negated by a deeper preference to serve the selfish and callous desire to achieve a teleological end.

Another critical reply could be made to Stirner: it can be admitted that we are flawed and make incorrect judgments or serve our own self-interests. However, a metaphysical entity such as God is pure and flawless. We cannot attribute any worldly qualities to God. To do so would be to humanise God and attribute finite qualities to an infinite Being. Following this, God must be considered as an absolutely good basis for our actions. Stirner anticipates this reply and responds: "… God cares only for what is his, busies himself only with himself, and has only himself before his eyes, woe to all that is not well-pleasing to *him*! He serves no higher person and satisfies only himself. His cause is – a purely egoistic cause."[272] For Stirner, the Christian God is comparable to Ancient Greek Gods. Ancient Greek Gods served their own personal interests and used humanity as a means for achieving them. As Ken Dowden explains "in most [Greek] myths the point of intercourse with a god is the offspring that results … if someone wishes proudly to claim that some hero [Hercules] or tribe is descended from Zeus, another adultery

[272] Ibid, pp.5-6

will usually be added to his list."[273] The image of Zeus the rapist and adulterer: "… is actually a product of the needs of what one might term 'international' poetry as it came together in the allegedly 'Dark Age' (say, 1200-776 BC). This was in fact a formative age, which had to combine different local traditions for the growing and dynamically self-aware market all over the Greek world."[274]

The Christian God is Creator of the world (Genesis 1:1) and all things contained within it. In this way, God has set the rules that we must abide by and is the perfect judge of our sins. Following this, we can think of God as a strict game master. We play the game to serve His ego by strictly abiding to his rules and we suffer severe punishment if we do not (You all have the potential to be my friend but only if you do exactly what I say). Richard Dawkins, like Stirner, comments on the egotistical nature of God: "the God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction: jealous and proud of it; a petty, unjust, unforgiving control-freak; a vindictive, bloodthirsty ethnic cleanser, a misogynistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal, sado-masochistic, capriciously malevolent bully."[275] The ego of God is also identified through the action of simply allowing us to live. This is because we are always at His mercy, at any given moment; we must abide by what He says, or face planetary oblivion.

By demonstrating the egotistical nature of metaphysical structures, does Stirner then hope to return to man as the creator of all structures? This is the view of Ludwig Feuerbach who argues in *The Essence of Christianity* (1841) that God is a

[273] Ken Dowden, *Zeus: Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006) p.40
[274] Ibid
[275] Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (New York: Mariner Books, 2008) p.51

reflection of human consciousness. As Marx W. Wartofsky explains "… [Human] reason makes God wholly other, objectifies Him in the form of nonhuman or superhuman perfection, separates Him from man utterly … Feuerbach's thesis [is that] this God of reason, or of the understanding is Himself an objectification of an aspect of *human* consciousness."[276] God is then a source of our conscious needs that we have dissociated from ourselves: "The God who is wholly other is nothing but the image of utter self-estrangement of consciousness from itself: and the sources of this self-estrangement lie in a real dichotomy within man."[277] For Stirner, we still do not resolve the problem of egoism by demonstrating that God is a human creation: "…man represents only another Supreme Being, nothing in fact has taken place but a metamorphosis in the Supreme Being, and the fear of man is merely an altered form of the fear of God."[278] This is because our Ego is personified in God. We use the concept of God for our own personal gain and interest. For instance, using the fear of hell as a tool of manipulation. People would then be manipulated in order to donate more money to the church. The irony is that the main gain is not to the church but rather to the priest or minister who becomes richer at the expense of others' belief.

Does Stirner then ask for an individual to be completely free, in a Hegelian sense, where humanity is in a process of moving towards an ever more rational society? Hegel's view is made in the posthumous *The Philosophy of History* (1831). His conception of history is that we will continually evolve towards greater and ever increasing higher forms of freedom. The world was not heading towards war or destruction but an enrichment of its shared sense of community and purpose. As

[276] Marx W. Wartofsky, *Feuerbach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) p.293
[277] Ibid
[278] Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*, p.166

Robert C. Solomon states "Hegel and his friends experienced that chaos [of the French Revolution and Napoleon Wars] … not as apocalypse … not as insanity … nor with despair … Hegel describes what he sees as … the beginning of the final realization of the human Spirit …or in simpler terms, the age-old ideal of the 'the perfectibility of humanity'."[279] For Stirner, our individuality is denied in the goal of achieving the ideal of a rational community: "who is it that to become free? You, I, we. Free from what? From everything that is not you, not I not we. I therefore … is to be delivered from all wrappings and – freed from all cramping shells"[280] That is, a rational society or utopian ideal is to eradicate all different perspectives in order to all agree upon the same values and share the same views. Anything that would differ from these views would then not be considered rational or good. From this image, we do not arrive at a utopian society but rather, a totalitarian one. For instance, we can relate this image to the Nazi's ideal of an Aryan race. By not fitting within this ideal Jews were persecuted, as William Brustein states "In the months following Nazi Germany's annexation of Austria in March 1938, Nazi persecution of Jews in Austria climbed dramatically. Jewish property was destroyed, persecution and violence against individual Jews became common place, and hundreds of Jews were marched off to prisons and concentration camps."[281]

By living our lives according to methodologies or aspiring towards goals we continually undermine our own ego. In other words, our unique individuality and perspective is always sapped. This realisation brings us to affirm our own ego and individuality. In doing so, we recognise that our ego that should take precedence

[279] Robert C. Solomon, *In The Spirit of Hegel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) p.33
[280] Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*, p.148
[281] William I. Brustein, *Roots of Hate: Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) p.1

over and above serving others: “I am the *owner* of my might, and I am so when I know myself as *unique*. In the *unique one* the owner himself returns to his creative nothing, of which he is born. Every higher essence above me, be it God, be it man, weakens the feeling of my uniqueness, and pales only before the sun of this consciousness.”[282] In Stirner’s view every individual is unique and incomparable: “I am not an ego along with other egos, but the sole ego: I am unique … my wants are too unique, and my deeds; in short, everything about me is unique. And it is only as this unique I that I take everything for my own, as I set myself to work … I do not develop men, nor as man, but, as I, I develop myself.”[283] The word unique affirms an extreme individualism where absolutely no external ends must determine an individual’s action. Individuals must be capable of developing according to their own ends. This is why each individual must determine his or her own ends as this further enables uniqueness. In this way, for Stirner, individuals flourish by determining their own ends where selfish action is always affirmed instead of negated.

Stirner’s unique ego is therefore completely metaphysical. In philosophical terms, it is pure difference. It is devoid of any worldly qualities. To determine its qualities is to begin the process of comparison and thereby detract from uniqueness. Hence we lack the ability to be describe the unique ego, as Camus remarks “Socrates, Jesus, Descartes, Hegel, all the prophets and philosophers, have done nothing but invent new methods of deranging what I am, the I that Stirner is so intent on distinguishing from the absolute I of Fichte by reducing it to its most specific and transitory aspect. ‘It has no name,’ it is the Unique.”[284] Stirner’s unique ego then

[282] Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*, p.324
[283] Ibid, pp.318-9
[284] Albert Camus, *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*, trans. by Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage Books, 1956) p.63

affirms our initial process of sense making described by Hegel in the *Phenomenology*. It is through our process of making sense that we attain a singular understanding of the world. This unique understanding is negated through the process of naming. Names negate our understanding through generalization. In this way, we are never able to express our own singular view or sense through names. Stirner seeks an even more radical form of singularity than Leibniz. In Leibniz's philosophy of language, we are unable to express difference in the world (all leaves are different). In contrast, for Stirner, nothing can adequately describe uniqueness (no leaf is truly unique). In philosophical terms, Leibniz maintains an immanent relation to his philosophy whilst Stirner's concept of unique ego is transcendent.

Deleuze on Stirner: the problem of non-conceptual difference

It is through this affirmation of novelty and differences that is otherwise negated by Hegel, that Saul Newman identifies a connection between Deleuze and Stirner: "Stirner's *ego* as a principle of difference is the logical counterpart to Deleuze's principle of non-conceptual difference. They both signify difference in itself—difference which defies the logic of representation. Moreover, both are actualisations of difference which lead to the construction of new multiplicities and pluralities".[285] In contrast to Zizek's Hegelian Deleuze, Newman presents us with the image of the Stirnerian Deleuze. This is because Deleuze also wants to challenge the Hegelian emphasis upon an Ideal structure that completely determines our understanding.

As have seen in his review of Hyppolite's *Logic and Existence*, for Deleuze,

[285] Saul Newman, 'Empiricism Pluralism, and Politics in Deleuze and Stirner', *Idealistic Studies*, Vol. 33, Issue. 1, 2003, p.16

the problem with the dialectical method is the denial of novelty. Stirner enables us to reflect upon the dialectic's denial of novelty, as Deleuze remarks: "the dialectic loves and controls history, but it has a history itself which it suffers from and which it does not control."[286] That is, by reflecting upon the absent qualities in a given object we deny its uniqueness. This is because its singular qualities are negated in preference to a generality. This set of general properties enables us to know how one thing differs from another. Stirner allows us to return to affirm those novelties in everyday experience, and our initial process of making sense that is otherwise negated. For instance, a generalisation of the *Mortal Kombat* video game series is a fighting game where one player has to defeat another in hand to hand combat. Each game differs from another based upon a set of new fighters that were introduced and improved technological advances. Yet this generalisation does not take into account the novel differences that occur in each play through. This is because the game requires us to react in a different way each time in order to exploit an opening or in defending our own character. This also does not take into account the novelty of learning the abilities of a character or in reacting to the ability of a new character. In this way, each time we play the game is novel since we must continually react differently in each play through in order to win.

However, Deleuze refrains from adopting Stirner's form of negation. This is because uniqueness is taken to its destructive extreme where we are left with nothingness: "the unique ego turns everything but itself into nothingness, and this nothingness is precisely its own nothingness, the ego's own nothingness."[287] In other

[286] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.152
[287] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.153

words, we are left with dualism, metaphysics with no relation into the world. Newman describes this point of nothingness, the destruction of all values and methods as the point of pure creativity: “This emptiness at the base of existence is a *creative nothingness*, a principle of difference through which new pluralities and multiplicities can be formed.”[288] Stirner’s complete denial of all structures and methods allows us to form our understanding of the world without being influenced by another’s opinion. In this way, *we have no apprenticeship but are the masters of our own understanding.* Yet in this affirmation of pure creativity and pure difference we have precisely denied the relation to the world and arrived at the absolute form of idealism. As Deleuze states: “… precisely because Stirner still thinks like a dialectician … he throws himself into the nothingness which he hollows out beneath the steps of the dialectic.”[289] With the dialectic’s focus on the negation of experiential world Stirner takes negation to its extreme. We should then see Stirner’s philosophy as an extension of Hegel’s, as John Welsh states "Stirner, who denied essences and focused on the pure consciousness of the ego, ay be called the ‘anti-Hegel’, but he is also the ‘complete’ Hegel because *The Ego and Its Own* completes the study of consciousness that Hegel began in the *Phenomenology* …”[290]

For Deleuze, we must rethink the role of negation in order to be affirmative of actuality and avoid the problem of dualism. In Stirner and Hegel, negation takes precedence over our immediate experiential relation to the world. In relation to our understanding, meaning always takes precedence over sense. We must reverse the

[288] Saul Newman, ‘Empiricism Pluralism, and Politics in Deleuze and Stirner’, p.16
[289] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.154
[290] John F. Welsh, *Max Stirner’s Dialectical Egoism: A New Interpretation* (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2010) p.36

role of negation in the dialectic to where *sense as individual process of understanding takes precedence over meaning.* This transforms the process of negation into an affirmative act that allows for a different of meanings to continually occur: "…the negative is transmuted and converted into an affirmative power."[291] This is not to agree with Stirner's position that our unique understanding takes completes precedence over all structures, but rather, that structure is important for our understanding.

The relation between metaphysics and the world or pure difference and its actualisation is made by James Williams in 'Why Deleuze Doesn't Blow the Actual on Virtual Priority'. Williams responds to Jack Reynolds' 'Wounds and Scars: Deleuze on Time and Ethics of the Event.' Reynold's argues that Deleuze prioritises his philosophy towards the creation of metaphysical concepts that take precedence over the actual world: "Even though the transcendental (virtual) is not fixed but fluid, and in an asymmetrical relation of reciprocal determination with the actual, it nonetheless retains a priority … over the body and states of affairs."[292] An example of this can be seen in Deleuze's ethical concepts such as the wound in the *Logic of Sense*: "[these] ethical principles derive from a hierarchical transcendental philosophy that gives to the body the lesser role: even when Deleuze talks of 'sensations' they come from the virtual and the surface more than from the realm of bodies and depths."[293]

[291] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, p.164
[292] Jack Reynolds, 'Wounds and Scars: Deleuze on the Time and Ethics of the Event', *Deleuze Studies*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, December 2007, p.162
[293] Ibid

Williams notes that this describes Deleuze's philosophy as: "… a dualist philosophy that is elitist and abstract from concrete [examples] of wounds and their scarification."[294] In contrast to this dualistic image, for Williams, we should view Deleuze's concepts as having practical application to the world: "… *a structure of interlinked processes that only acquire determination in practical situations*."[295] In denying structures as purely metaphysical, a connection to Hegel can be made. We arrive at an understanding of structure by reflecting upon the actual objects. At the same time, this structure is not completely ideal but has a necessary practical application in understanding world. Yet in contrast to Hegel, we never arrive at complete knowledge through rational reflection. This is because our practical application of a method remains experimental: "*no given practice can be a secure blueprint for another, every practice is actual, the practice is necessarily experimental, it never arrives at a goal, it is not directed towards or towards sense, and it is directed towards a clinical and critical affirmation of our actual lives and shared communication through events.*"[296] In this way, Deleuze affirms the experimental primacy of a process of apprenticeship. This is to adopt a structure that is socially preconditioned in order to understand the world. Yet this structure does not always determine how we understand the world. It is continually transformed through practical application. In philosophical terms, we continually make sense of the structure and, in doing so, we continually revaluate and transform our knowledge. This is not to deny meaning altogether but to submit it to novel and continually experimental interactions with this structure. We then arrive neither at Hegel's position where meaning stands over sense nor at Stirner's position of sense

[294] James Williams, 'Why Deleuze Doesn't Blow the Actual on Virtual Priority. A Rejoinder to Jack Reynolds', *Deleuze Studies*, Vol. 2, Issue 1, June 2008, p.98
[295] Ibid
[296] Ibid, p.99

over meaning. Deleuze affirms both positions simultaneously, sense and meaning, or the necessity of structure for our education and our continual experimentation with the structure.

Conclusion

For Hegel, we first understand the world through the process of making sense. This is to gain a child-like understanding based upon a purely sensual interaction with the world. In order to know, a name must be attributed to given things. We must negate our experiential knowledge in order to move towards knowledge of its ideal structure. This ideal structure allows us to conceptualise and define the world. *We then arrive at knowledge through conceptual difference*. These ideal conceptual differences describe actual things as they appear to us. This allows us to correctly define worldly qualities and differentiate them (Blue is not Black). It is through the process of rational reflection, which enables us to reflect upon an inherent grammatical structure, that we can be correctly understood by others.

For Stirner, our unique understanding is continually undermined in not serving our own immediate needs but rather the possibility of attaining a future state. This is identified in the Christian performance of a good action in order to achieve the possibility of heaven in the afterlife. This can also be identified in the Hegelian possibility of achieving a rationalist utopia. In order to affirm our uniqueness, we must be completely free from all determination. In this way, we can care for another individual for itself without having to worry about the afterlife. In the political context, we can avoid problems of a totalitarian state where all our unique differences are denied in preference to an ideal norm. From Stirner, *our knowledge is based upon*

non-conceptual difference. We cannot conceptualise or define our own unique perspective. From this, we arrive at Stirner's radical definition of uniqueness as pure difference that cannot be actualised. Comparable to Hegel, our task is to completely negate all experiential qualities and reflect upon its purely rational qualities. Yet in contrast to Hegel, this is not to reflect upon the same structure but rather, a unique one. In doing so, knowledge becomes based upon an affirmation of multiplicity rather than the One.

For Deleuze, the problem with Hegel's conceptual difference is the denial of novelty. This is because of Hegel's generalisation of difference. In relation to our understanding, our initial process of making sense of the world is negated in preference to meaning. In order to know, we must associate names to given things. It is through this name, that we negate the singularity of the given object. In Deleuzian philosophical terms, we negate an experimental process of apprenticeship. This is the process of learning that is attained through novel engagement with the world. We must repeat predefined features in order for our understanding to be correct, but in repeating the same we must deny not our novel interactions with the structure. We must therefore always engage in thoroughgoing experimentation in order to affirm a process of apprenticeship that changes the structures.

Deleuze's critical remarks on a dialectical approach to history further illustrate the negation of sense by meaning. In a Hegelian approach to history, we arrive at general qualities that define each epoch or decade. Yet this does not take into account the minor or forgotten elements that were not part of popular mainstream

culture. For instance, Hume's empiricism was not popular during his life. Despite this, he is regarded as one of history's most influential and important philosophers, as Saul Traiger remarks "David Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature* … Although its initial reception led Hume to describe it as having fallen '*dead-born from the Press*,' the influence of the Treatise on the philosophical world is incalculable. Immanuel Kant, for example, admitted that Hume's ideas caused him to awake from his dogmatic slumbers and begin work on *The Critique of Pure Reason*."[297]

Deleuze's problem with Stirner's non-conceptual difference is that our unique understanding can never be actualised. In order to affirm uniqueness Stirner uses a more radical form of negation than Hegel. This is because in the Hegelian form of negation, in order to arrive at an ideal structure, we must reflect on the experiential object that is immediately present to our senses. For Stirner, in order for each object to remain completely unique it must be incomparable. We cannot associate any given qualities, as this would begin the process of identifying comparable qualities. Following this negation of all worldly qualities we are left with nothingness. In philosophical terms, pure difference, a metaphysical form of difference that cannot be actualised. In this Stirnerian model of apprenticeship, we no longer seek to affirm the same understanding but our own unique perspective. This would deny all general methods and techniques as guides for our knowledge in order for us to discover and educate ourselves. We then arrive at a paradox for education, since we can never assist another in his or her education. It is at this point that Stirner's negation is completely destructive. For instance, in an everyday sense, we would not read,

[297] Saul Traiger 'Introduction in Saul Traiger (ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006) p.1

watch TV, play games, listen to others opinions and so forth. *We must then carve out our own opinion yet at the same time we must refrain from sharing it.*

Deleuze's position is therefore between Hegel and Stirner, a conceptual difference that paradoxically affirms pure difference. Deleuze seeks an apprenticeship that aims to affirm our process of making sense of the world and, at the same time, allows our understanding to affect and transform structures. This is not to affirm the initial influence of structures for our understanding and then later disregard them, in preference to our own understanding. For Deleuze, we require structure as a mobile foundation for our understanding of the world. It is through our novel and continual interaction with the structure that we develop our own style but at the same time we retain the value and practical use of the method. From this, we can be critical of interpretations of Deleuze, as anti-Hegelian or affirming a philosophy of pure becoming. We must overcome the either/or opposition in viewing Deleuze's philosophy. Deleuze draws upon the paradoxical tensions within empiricist and rationalist philosophies. In philosophical terms, this is to affirm a philosophy of the Many *and* the One, rather than, the One over the Many or the Many over the One.

It is the purpose of the next chapter to further develop Deleuze's concept of apprenticeship in *Proust and Signs*. My analysis of the concept of apprenticeship in *Proust and Signs* will draw upon the rationalist and empiricist tension in Deleuze's epistemology. The next chapter will seek to discover the aims of a rationalist apprenticeship through a reading of Descartes. This rationalist apprenticeship will be illuminated by the contemporary work linguistic work of Noam Chomsky. Problems

will also be highlighted in Hobbes and the sociolinguistic work of William Labov. Chapter 4 will develop an alternative Leibnizian apprenticeship that affirms an empirical approach. Following this it must be noted that my later Deleuzian reading of Leibniz is in contrast to the popular image of him being a purely rationalist philosopher.

3

The image of thought and a Cartesian apprenticeship to signs

Introduction

My claim in the thesis has been so far that in order for us to arrive at knowledge of the world we must first make sense of it. From my reading of Stirner in the previous chapter, this understanding cannot be completely unique. This is because for unique understanding we must affirm a metaphysics of pure difference with no possible way of actualising our knowledge. To avoid this, our process of making sense of the world must be defined according to an image of thought. This is to provide a structure that we can apply to the world in order for individuals to learn and for us to educate others. A rationalist philosophy privileges the necessity of reason in order for us to reflect upon universal ideals. It is these ideals that provide structure for our experiential knowledge. As we have seen in the previous chapter's analysis of Hegel's philosophy, this is where we must reflect upon the absent qualities in objects that are immediately presented to our senses. In doing so, we reflect upon the ideal qualities which enable one object to be differentiated from another.

In contrast, an empiricist philosophy emphasises the necessity of making sense. It is argued that we must be able to associate qualities from our experience to ideas. Otherwise these ideas remain blank. It is our experience and social and

cultural background that provide a structure for our knowledge. Individuals' experience dictates whether they associate positively or negatively towards particular ideas. For instance, an individual who has not tried a particular food item will associate different elements and determine the means and ends of their enjoyment through their past experience.

In an interview in 1968 for the leftist magazine *Les Lettres Françaises*, Deleuze states that the image of thought connects his early works of *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, *Proust and Signs* and *Bergsonism*:

> Hume, Bergson and Proust interest me so much because in their work can be found profound elements for a new image of thought … we live with a particular image of thought, that is to say, before we begin to think, we have a vague idea of what it means to think, its means and ends. And then someone comes along and proposes another idea, a whole other image.[1]

A new image of thought, an alternative structure for knowledge, enables us to think of things differently. In other words, a new structure enables us to be open to possibilities that otherwise remained oblivious to us in our adherence to a previous model. In this way, a new image of thought challenges both the rationalist and empirical models' denial of novelty. In the rationalist model novelty is denied in preference to the Ideal (all shades of blue share the same essence of blueness). In

[1] Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts 1953-1974*, ed. by David Lapoujade, trans. by Michael Taormina (London: Semiotext(e), 2004) p.139

the empiricist model novelty is denied in preference to association (my idea of blue is formed by associating various shades together). The problem in both cases is that we cannot directly think, express or make sense of things differently. This is because a new structure must always conform to either a rationalist or empirical position tied to either a transcendental ideal or to prior experience mediated by a transcendent principle such as Hume's causal principle. In philosophical terms, our understanding must be always be based upon a transcendent foundation, though this is different for rationalism and empiricism. This is because a transcendent foundation enables an absolute foundation for meaning.

In *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Deleuze outlines the rationalist and empirical move towards a transcendent foundation. This move occurs through three stages: to define the condition for arriving at truth, the identification of errors, and lastly, the method for avoidance of errors. Firstly, the condition for arriving at truth is rational reflection upon our thoughts and actions. The ability to reason is a natural process that is inherent within humanity and traditionally distinguishes us from animals: "… thought possesses or formally contains truth … it is therefore sufficient to think 'truly' or 'really' in order to think with truth."[2] With the use of rational reflection we are not led into deception by believing in others' opinion. It enables us to be critical of opinions and begin to think for ourselves. For instance, despite our friend's attempts at making us like their favourite band, by using rational reflection, we can criticise certain aspects of the music. In philosophical terms, reason enables us to problematise idolatry and common opinion in order to move towards a more 'realistic' and stable basis.

[2] Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson (London: Continuum, 2006) p.96

This leads to the second stage, the identification of errors. An error is an action that deviates from a rational choice: “we are … told that we are ‘diverted’ from the truth but by forces which are foreign to it … *Error*: this would be merely the effect … of external forces which are opposed to thought.”[3] This enables us to move away from basing our action or words on pure emotion or passion. By passionately acting we could harm others and ourselves. Rational reflection enables us to avoid harm by consideration of how our actions and words would affect others. This leads into the final stage where an epistemic method is constructed in order to teach us how to identify errors and make good decisions: “we are told … that all we need to think well, to think truthfully, is a *method*. Method is an artifice but one through which we are brought back to the nature of thought … [in order to] ward off the effect of the alien forces which alter and distract us.”[4] It is through an epistemic methodology that meaning becomes transcendent. This is because all deviations from its general principles are determined as alien. We must always adhere to the same universal principles in our lives in order to make rational choices.

The irony then is that initially both empiricist and rationalist approaches seek to affirm our immediate experiential interaction with the world, overcome deception and arrive at meaning. Yet we arrive at a metaphysical methodology that is detached from worldly forces and processes: “… it conceives of truth as an abstract universal. We are never referred to the real forces that *form* thought, thought itself is never

[3] Ibid
[4] Ibid

related to the real forces that it presupposes *as thought*."[5] For Deleuze, in seeking to secure meaning, philosophers have neglected the experiential forces that influence the construction of a concept. We must therefore revaluate our consideration of meaning in order to take sense making into account. By taking sense into consideration we no longer seek to determine truth, as he remarks, "truth, as a concept, is entirely undetermined. Everything depends on the value and sense of what we think. We always have the truths we deserve as a function of the sense of what we conceive, of the value of what we believe."[6]

Truth should not be considered part of an unconditional transcendent foundation but rather a conditional one. This condition is based upon the sense and value that we place upon a certain truth. We must take into account the underlying worldly forces that motivated the construction of our privileging of a certain given value. Deleuze here draws upon a Humean influence, namely, to demonstrate the flaws in our belief in associations. This is because through association we seek a causal connection between our experience and an idea (experiential qualities A, B, C adhere to my idea X). The problem is that we believe that a given set of qualities will always adhere to the same idea. When we take worldly forces into account our association of qualities remains only temporary. An association remains only temporary due to the different processes out with our immediate control that affects our idea. The analysis of these worldly processes enables us to understand why specific concepts were created at specific periods in time: "the truth of a thought must be interpreted and evaluated according to the forces or power that determine it

[5] Ibid, p.97
[6] Ibid

to think and to think this rather than that."[7] For instance, our particular like or dislike towards certain foods is considered to be always the same (I'll have X, it's my favourite, aren't I always predictable?) Yet Deleuze makes us reflect upon the continual immanent changes that occur to our taste buds as different flavours are encountered. In Deleuze's terminology the general term for this experiential encounter is affects[8].

It is the aim of this chapter to develop Deleuze's criticism of a transcendent foundation for meaning. This is in order to demonstrate the inseparable immanent relations in formation of our ideas and the creation of concepts. My criticism of a transcendent foundation for meaning then further develops the experimental immanent apprenticeship from the previous chapter. This is because Deleuze's concept of apprenticeship in *Proust and Signs* is developed in opposition to a traditional educational method where in order to be correct an individual repeats the same expected meaning: "… [Proust's novels] the Search [for Lost Time] is first of all a search for truth. Thereby is manifested the 'philosophical' bearing of Proust's work: it vies with philosophy ... He attacks what is most essential in a classical philosophy of the rationalist type: the presuppositions of this philosophy."[9] I identify this classical philosophical structure of apprenticeship with Descartes' *Rules for the Direction of*

[7] Ibid
[8] A scientific example of different taste affects has been demonstrated in an experiment by psychologists, Richard J. Stevenson, John Prescott and Robert A. Boakes as they state "This study investigated the relationship between perception of an odour when smelled and the taste of a solution when to which the odour is added as flavorant. In Experiment 1 … certain odours were found to enhance tasted sweetness while others suppressed it … In Experiment 2 … the most sweet smelling odour, caramel, was found to suppress the sourness of citric acid and … to enhance the sweetness of sucrose … The study demonstrated that the effects of odours on taste perception are not limited to sweetness enhancement and apply to sour as well as sweet tastes." Richard J. Stevenson, John Prescott and Robert A. Boakes, 'Confusing Tastes and Smells: How Odours can Influence the Perception of Sweet and Sour Tastes', *Chemical Sciences*, Vol. 26, Issue 6, June, 1999.
[9] Gilles Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, trans. by Richard Howard (London: Continuum, 2008) p.60

the Mind. These rules are then practically implemented in the *Meditations on First Philosophy*. It is the aim of the Cartesian apprentice to reflect upon the transcendent sign. This is achieved through the process of rational deduction that eliminates a multiplicity of senses in order for an individual to reflect upon the absolute meaning. I connect Chomsky's philosophy of language in *Cartesian Linguistics* and *Syntactic Structures* to a modern Cartesian apprenticeship. This is because of the Cartesian nature of Chomsky's concept of deep grammar. Put simply, grammatical structure is innate. In this way, even when we speak nonsense it still makes sense since it adheres to a grammatical structure.

In contrast to the Cartesian transcendent foundation for language, I demonstrate the underlying immanent relation for our understanding and language. This is made through my analysis of Hobbes' objection to Descartes' emphasis upon signs. Hobbes emphasizes the importance of the imagination in an individual's ability to clearly understand. We cannot then purely reflect without making sense of and imagining an idea. Hobbes' objection is connected here to William Labov's linguistics work in *Sociolinguistics*. Labov's linguistic approach demonstrates that speech and tonal pronunciation are formed from various environmental influences such as working environment, financial income, social and cultural backgrounds. I analyse Deleuze and Guattari's reading of Chomsky and Labov in *A Thousand Plateaus* in order to demonstrate the dangers posed in negating these influences. This is illustrated through their analysis of Chomsky and Labov's readings of African American English. A Chomskyian approach results in racism by seeking to always correct an African American child's incorrect use of pronunciation. Labov's alternative approach affirms the child's novel use of language and different style.

This chapter's discussion of Deleuze and Guattari therefore builds upon Deleuze's critical comments on a rationalist apprenticeship in *Proust and Signs.* It allows an alternative to the rationalist method (focused upon the reflection of transcendent signs and creation of a pure metaphysical foundation) to be presented that takes into account both the importance of both immanent processes and structure. For Deleuze and Guattari we must affirm the paradoxical relation between names and signs. By affirming these, we allow for different uses of language and the attainment of novel meaning. Due to this, it must be noted that I do not take the position that Deleuze privileges a philosophy of pure immanence. The next chapter will demonstrate that Deleuze's philosophy expresses thought as both immanent and transcendent process. This is to affirm the paradox of maintaining the pure singularity of our understanding whilst, at the same time, the necessity of its actualization through the use of general terms.

Descartes' deductive method for making sense

Descartes constructs a rationalist methodology in *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* (1625-8). The reason for the necessity of rational methodology is to allow for an individual to arrive at clear understanding. For Descartes, our initial empirical education is based learning a particular technique or skill. This skill is defined according to the role in which an individual will practically use it. An apprentice farmer will learn how to correctly use a hoe. Or a musician will use learn how to correctly place their fingers and hands in order to produce a sound on a guitar. The problem with this approach is that we only learn a specific technique and not the universal one: "[Uneducated individuals] see that not all arts can be learned by the same man, but that a man can perform an art best and most easily who perform that

one only, since the same hands are not so suitable for both agriculture and playing the lute ..."[10] This would mean that an empirical apprenticeship limits our understanding to learning particular skills. In order to know we would then have to learn every possible technique and skill. Descartes therefore wants to arrive a universal method with the same fundamental principles that can be applied to all variations in a discipline. In learning these principles individuals could apply their knowledge to all fields. In this way, our choice of a specific field within a discipline does not limit our knowledge because all fields share the same methods and techniques.

In order to arrive at knowledge of these universal principles we must move, in logical terms, from an inductive method to one based upon rational deduction. A rationally deductive method allows for an apprentice to make sense of their thoughts and thereby attaining clarity and meaning. As Descartes states "The purpose of our studies should be the direction of the mind towards the production of firm and true judgments concerning all things which come to its attention."[11] Inductive or empirical reasoning is based upon the premise that any conclusion can always be called into question. The conclusion drawn from this line of argument is then never absolute but based upon the best possible evidence at a given time. As trial lawyers Ronald J. Waicukauski, Paul Mark Sandler and JoAnne Epps state:

[10] Rene Descartes, *Philosophical Essays: Discourse on Method, Meditations and Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, trans. by Laurence J. Lafeur (New York: Macmillian Publishing, 1989) p.147
[11] Ibid, p.165-6

> … when a conclusion relies upon an inference and contains new information not found in the premises, the reasoning is inductive. For example, if premises were established that the defendant slurred his words … and smelled of alcohol, you might reasonably infer the conclusion that the defendant was drunk … [from this it can be seen that] in an inductive argument the conclusion is at best probable.[12]

In this case, the lawyer infers from an association of signifiers, the smell of alcohol and slurring of words, that the defendant is drunk. However, we no longer rely on actual evidence but from our own belief. In this way, our prior experience affects our judgment. This is to allow for our own personal bias, social and cultural backgrounds to cloud our minds.

In contrast, for Descartes, a rationally deductive method enables us to make certain and indubitable judgments: "…'deduction' or the pure logical inference from one thing to another, can never be performed improperly by an intellect which is in the last degree rational, although it may escape our attention if we do not happen to notice it."[13] It is through our rational deduction of the experiential evidence that enables us to arrive at a clear judgment. In philosophical terms, we arrive at an unbiased judgment and truth, rather than, a biased opinion. As Steven M. Nadler states "Knowledge about the world can, Descartes insists, come only by moving beyond the confused testimony of the senses … with which we are presented to get

[12] Ronald J. Waicukauski, Paul Mark Sandler and JoAnne Epps, *The Winning Argument* (Illinois: American Bar Association Publishing, 2001) p.48
[13] Rene Descartes, *Philosophical Essays*, p.151

to get to a scientific core that is conceptually pure and composed only of 'clear and distinct' elements."[14] This clarity is achieved by "… the intellect and the proper and critical use of our reasoning faculties."[15] For instance, a jury rationally deduce from the evidence and arguments given whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. By basing their judgment upon the evidence, the jury does not allow for their bias to affect the outcome for the defendant (Despite his shifty features, from the evidence provided, I must conclude that he is not guilty).

It is this rational framework that we must apply to our own understanding in order to determine the validity of a truth claim. In order for our understanding to remain free from others influence we must adopt a singular apprenticeship[16]: "… *we should seek to determine, not what others have thought, nor what we ourselves conjecture, but what we can clearly and evidently intuit, or deduce with certainty; for in no other way is knowledge obtained*."[17] Comparable to Stirner, it is only though our own personal apprenticeship that we can be certain of the truth. Yet, in contrast to Stirner, this is not to arrive at various unique understandings, but rather, to ascertain the validity of the truth claim. By questioning this validity Descartes then tests

[14] Steven Nadler, *The Philosopher, the Priest, and the Painter: A Portrait of Descartes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013) p.91
[15] Ibid
[16] From this avocation of a singular apprenticeship, Descartes is affirmative of his own rigorous education at Collège La Flèche, a Jesuit institution. An insight into the curriculum is given by Roger Ariew: "The philosophical curriculum at La Flèche is fairly well-known, and the daily routine of its students well-documented. At La Flèche, as in other Jesuit colleges of the time, the curriculum in philosophy would have lasted three years (the final three years of a student's education, from about the age of fifteen on). It would have consisted of lectures twice a day in sessions lasting two hours each, from a set curriculum based primarily on Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. During Descartes time, the first year was devoted to logic and ethics, consisting of commentaries and questions based on Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Categories*, *On Interpretation*, *Prior Analytics*, *Topics*, *Posterior Analytics*, and *Nicomachean Ethics*. The second year was devoted to physics and metaphysics, based primarily on Aristote's *Physics*, *De Caelo*, *On Generation and Corruption* Book 1, and *Metaphysics* Books, 1, 2 and 11. The third year of philosophy was a year of mathematics, consisting of arithmetics, geometry, music and astronomy …" Roger Ariew, 'Descartes and scholasticism: the intellectual background to Descartes' thought' in *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes* ed. by John Cottingham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) p.60
[17] Rene Descartes, *Descartes Philosophical Essays*, p.152

whether it is universally applicable and not based upon an individual's bias or egoism. As Daniel Garber's remarks "Descartes' rule of method has two steps, a *reductive step*, in which 'involved and obscure propositions' are reduced to simpler ones, and a *constructive step*, in which we proceed from simpler propositions back to the more complex."[18] The purpose of the rational framework is then constructive where we can arrive at a clear and distinct understanding through the process of simplification:

> Ultimately, Descartes thinks, when we follow out this series of questions, from the one that first interests us, to the 'simpler' and more basic questions on which it depends, we will eventually reach an intuition … having intuited the answer … we can turn the procedure on its head, and begin answering the questions that we have successively raised, in the reserve of the order in which we have raised them.[19]

By following this method Descartes then enables us to have us to have a practical way to overcome problems that we face: "what the method gives us is a *workable procedure* for discovering an appropriate intuition, one from which the answer to the question posed can be deduced, and it shows us the path the deduction must follow."[20]

[18] Daniel Garber, *Descartes Embodied: Reading Cartesian Philosophy Through Cartesian Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) p.87
[19] Ibid, pp.89-90
[20] Ibid, p.90

For instance, if I asked the question, what is a dog? I could be presented with various answers based different types, a Chihuahua, a Labrador, a Great Dane. Yet I am not presented with a clear answer, simplifying this question to what qualities do dogs have in common? Enables a more general answer. They are hairy, four-legged, have claws, two eyes and tails. Further simplifying this question, why are these qualities necessary? We are presented with an answer based upon satisfaction of its bodily desires such as its need for food and its sex drive. Using Descartes' method we can now successfully answer the question what is a dog? A dog is an animal that uses its claws and teeth in order to satisfy its bodily desires of hunger. This same quality is apparent throughout the various types and breeds of dogs. Therefore the rational method enables us to reduce a multiplicity of possible answers to one clear answer through a process of simplification and intuition.

Descartes' project in his later *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641) is an expression of the apprenticeship that is detailed in the earlier *Rules*. However, the *Meditations* does not seek to provide a revaluated set of rules for an apprenticeship but asks for the reader to take a meditative journey with him: "… I do not advise anyone to read [this book] except those who have both the ability and the desire to meditate seriously with me, and to withdraw their minds from the senses as well as from all prejudices … those who do not take the time to grasp the order and linkage of my arguments … will derive little benefit from reading this work."[21] By sharing a comparable journey with Descartes the reader must forgo all their prior knowledge and only reflect on the truths that are obtained through meditation. In doing so, the

[21] Rene Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy* trans. by Donald A. Cress, 3rd Edition (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1993) p.6

reader will be able to discover for themselves the validity of his findings. Descartes' affirmed this process of testing by forwarding copies of the *Meditations* to a number of fellow intellectuals and replied to their criticisms. These intellectuals included, Johannes Caterus[22] [Johan de Kater] (1590–1655), Marin Mersenne[23] (1588-1648), Thomas Hobbes[24] (1588-1679), Antoine Arnauld[25] (1612-1694) and Pierre Gassendi[26] (1592-1655).

---

[22] Caterus, a Catholic Priest and theologian replied to Descartes' *Meditations* by request of his mutual friends and fellow priests Jan Bannius and Augustinus Alstenius, as Roger Ariew and Donald A. Cress explain "…Descartes asked his friends Jan Albert Bannius and Augustinus Alstenius Bloemaert to write some objections; they, in turn, asked the Dutch priest Caterus (Johan de Kater) to do so. Rene Descartes, *Meditations, Objections and Replies*, ed. by Roger Ariew and trans. by Donald A. Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2006) p.vii

[23] Mersenne, a priest, formed a friendship with Descartes whilst they were students, as Carol MacClintock remarks "showing intellectual promise, he was sent to school at the Jesuit College of Le Mans and then to the college at La Fleche … Here he was a fellow student of … Descartes, with whom he founded a lifelong friendship … In Paris, together with Descartes and other intellectual friends, he formed a discussion group, or 'academy', to study the sciences." Carol MacClintock (ed. and trans.), *Readings in the History of Music in Performance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979) p.152. One accomplishment of Mersenne was his work in music theory: "the result of Mersenne's interest and investigation in music was the publication of his *Harmonie Universelle* (1636), a massive work comprising studies on the nature of sound, mechanics, consonance and dissonance, modes, composition, the voice and singing, and especially instruments – their construction, range, musical possibilities." Ibid. Another accomplishment of Mersenne's was his work in mathematics, as John Tabak explains "…Marsenne … is a prominent figure in the history of mathematics. He was a talented mathematician, who enjoyed studying the theory of numbers and discovered a class of prime numbers that are now called Mersenne primes." John Tabak, *Geometry: The Language of Space and Form* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2004) p.73

Mersenne is attributed to have written the second and sixth set of objections to the *Meditations* despite it being attributed to various authors in the text. As John Cottingham states "The Second Set of Objections is simply attributed to 'theologians and philosophers in the index to the first edition, but the French version of 1647 announces that they were 'collected by the Reverend Father Mersenne'. In fact they are largely the work of Mersenne himself … the Sixth Set of Objections was printed with no indication of the author in the first and second editions, and is described in the 1647 French edition as being by 'various theologians and philosophers'. The compiler, as in the case of the Second Objections, is Mersenne." John Cottingham 'Objections and Replies Translator's Preface' in Rene Descartes, *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes* Vol. II, trans. by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoof and Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984) p.64

[24] Hobbes is a political philosopher, his most famous work is *The Leviathan* (1642) in which he describes how individuals in a state of nature would be a war of all against all. That is, all individuals would ultimately act on their own selfish needs, forgoing any empathy or assistance for others. In order to avoid this state of anarchy a social contract must be undertaken by all individuals in which a monarchical state can effectively govern the populous. Prior to the writing *The Leviathan,* Hobbes wrote a political treatise *The Elements of Law: Natural and Politic* (1640) which also argues for the benefits of a monarchical state, however, with an impending civil war (English Civil War 1642-1651) his view met hostility and was forced into exile. As Richard H. Popkin elaborates "In [the Elements of Law], Hobbes defends the authority of monarchy against the rising force of Parliamentarians. Hobbes' argument generated personal hostility and, perhaps also foreseeing the coming civil war, he fled to Paris, where he remained for the next eleven years. It was there that he wrote much of his greatest work, including *De Cive* and *Leviathan*, which marked the end of his Paris period." Richard H. Popkin (ed.), *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999) p.347

Descartes and language: towards pure concepts of the mind

For Descartes, empirical language is to give names to the various sensual and qualitative attributes of objects that have an immediate effect on our perception. This can be identified in a deconstruction of the wax example in Meditation Two: "it has been quite recently taken from the honeycomb; it has not yet lost all the honey flavour. It retains some of the scent of the flowers from which it was collected. Its colour, shape, and size are manifest. It is hard and cold; it is easy to touch. If you rap on it with your knuckle it will emit a sound."[27] In order to correctly understand the collection of properties an individual must undergo an apprenticeship. This is where

---

The third set of objections to the *Meditations* is accredited to Hobbes. Prior to his critical remarks on the Meditations he had reviewed a copy of Descartes' *Discourse on Method* in 1637 "In 1637, Hobbes received a copy of Descartes' *Discourse on Method* from an associate. After a few years, Hobbes recorded his opinion … in a manuscript that was sent to Marin Mersenne. Shortly thereafter, Mersenne provided Hobbes with an original print of Descartes' *Meditations on First Philosophy*." Stephen J. Finn, *Thomas Hobbes and the Politics of Natural Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2006) p.102

[25] Arnauld was a theologian and due to the logical rigour of his arguments was a respected thinker by his contemporaries. This can be seen in Steven M. Nadler's commentary: "His opinion on both philosophical and theological matters was earnestly sought by Descartes, Leibniz and others who had a profound respect for his philosophical acumen and for the logical rigor of his mind … Arnauld's most important contribution to philosophy lies in his analysis of perception and his role in the polemic over ideas and knowledge that took place in the seventeenth century. In *Des vraies et des fausses idees* (1683), Arnauld offers a sophisticated direct realist theory of perception and an analysis of the intentionality of mental acts in response to the doctrine of ideas and indirect perception presented by Nicolas Malebranche in *De la recherché de la verite* (1712)." Steven M. Nadler, *Arnauld and the Cartesian Philosophy of Ideas* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989) pp.1-2.

Arnauld's introduction to philosophy was to respond to a copy of the *Meditations* which he had received from Mersenne: "… Arnauld's real introduction to the philosophical world, and the basis for his attraction to Cartesian thought, are his exchanges with Descartes in the 1640s concerning the latter's *Meditationes de Prima Philosophia* … Arnauld addressed his objections to Mersenne early in 1641, and they appeared to Descartes himself to be the most acute and serious of the responses he received." Ibid, p.21.

[26] Gassendi was an important thinker on atom theory and sought to reconcile Christian theory with Epicurean atomism. Kenneth C. Clatterbaugh explains how Gassendi was able to reconcile these views: "… [Gassendi] abandon[ed] his projected seven-part work on Aristotle in 1628 in favour of a study and rehabilitation of Epicurean atomism. Gassendi's atomism transformed the ancient atomism of Democritus and Epicurus by inserting God as the creator and maintainer of atoms in the void … Just when his *Physics* was almost finished in 1637, Gassendi lost his enthusiasm for atomism, fearing ... [a] deterministic (atheistic) materialism … But in 1641 Gassendi revived his project and before his death in 1655 completed the *Syntagma Philosophicum*, which contains his mature physics …"Kenneth C. Clatterbaugh, *The Causation Debate in Modern Philosophy*: *1637-1739* (London: Routledge, 1999)p.68

Gassendi asked by Mersenne to write a response to the *Meditations* and during this time he was acquainted and became friends with Hobbes: "In [1640] … Mersenne introduced Hobbes to Pierre Gassendi, he asked both men to prepare objections to Descartes's *Meditations* … During the time in which they were preparing their objections, Hobbes and Gassendi became close friends and correspondents, exchanging views on various philosophical topics." Ibid, p.67.

[27] Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, p.21

an individual would not just learn a specific methodology but also how to decipher signs. The basis for their interpretation of signs would depend upon which profession they sought to learn. For instance, an individual would then have to decide be an artist, musician or mathematician in order to fully understand the wax's use of colour, sound or its shape and size.

However, a problem emerges for an apprenticeship since none of these immediate experiential properties remain the same: "[but as] I am bringing it close to the fire. The remaining traces of the honey flavour are disappearing; the scent is vanishing; the colour is changing; the original shape is disappearing. Its size is increasing; it is becoming liquid and hot … and now, when you rap on it, it no longer emits any sound."[28] With the transformation of experiential qualities, an apprentice cannot make a correct interpretation of signs. This is because what we initially thought to be correct properties of the wax, such as it being hard and cold, is incorrect since it has become liquid and hot. As Kurt Brandhorst states

> Having employed the activity of sensing in the investigation of the wax, Descartes identifies the limits of this approach and hence the limits of sensing in general: sensing can only report on the sensible properties of an object but not what makes that object persist through time, through changes of those sensible properties.[29]

[28] Ibid
[29] Kurt Brandhorst, *Descartes' Meditations on First Philosophy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010) p.78

For Descartes, this represents a lack in empirical language's capacity to adequately express the essence of the sign: "for although I am considering these things within myself silently and without words nevertheless I seize upon words themselves *I am nearly deceived by the ways in which people commonly speak*."[30] That is, the various empirical qualities that are commonly discussed by individuals fail to express its unchanging and timeless qualities. This leads to a distortion of the sign where a variety of sensual qualities are illegitimately identified as an absolute foundation for meaning.

This empirical distortion is created by the failure of our imagination to encompass every possible form that the wax could take: "… Is it what my imagination shows it to be; namely, that this piece of wax can change from a round to a square shape, or from the latter to a triangle shape? Not at all; for I grasp that the wax is capable of innumerable changes of this sort, even though I am incapable of running through these innumerable changes by using my imagination."[31] For Descartes, our imagination is limited since we are only capable of reflecting on various experiential associations. For instance, a fantasy creature from Greek mythology, is not completely abstract, but rather, a collection of various experiential qualities: "for … when painters themselves wish to represent sirens and satyrs by means of especially bizarre forms, they surely cannot assign to them utterly new natures. Rather, they simply fuse together the members of various animals."[32]

[30] Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, p.22 – italics added for emphasis.
[31] Ibid
[32] Ibid, p.15

Despite this limitation of the imagination we can still arrive at clarity. Clarity emerges by seeking to understand an empirical object's universal properties. This is to be able to reflect upon which properties always remain the same despite its qualitative transformation: "let us … see what remains after we have removed everything that does not belong to the wax; only that it is something extended, flexible and mutable."[33] The universal properties of wax that is revealed through rational reflection is that it is an extension of our mind, capable of being manipulated and bent. These timeless qualities then enable us to arrive at a correct judgment and decipherment of a sign through a establishing a transcendent foundation for the meaning: "…I would not judge correctly what the wax is if I did not believe that it takes on greater variety of dimensions that I could ever grasp with the imagination …"[34] A transcendent foundation is created since we identify the pure qualities of an object. These qualities will always remain the same despite any transformation in our experience.

By understanding these universal properties of an object Descartes comes to the realisation that his mind mediates sensory experience: "… it remains for me to concede that I do not grasp what this wax is through the imagination; rather I perceive it through the mind alone."[35] It is an individual's mind that applies a structure of understanding to the wax.[36] The structure that is applied to experience is composed of universal properties of an object. As Desmond M. Clarke remarks:

[33] Ibid, p.21
[34] Ibid, p.22
[35] Ibid
[36] It is through the dependence on how the mind gives a structure and framework to experience that Descartes shares a comparable relation to Hegel's philosophy. However, an important difference must be noted, namely, that Descartes affirms the role of experience to a greater extent than in Hegelian philosophy. Descartes wants to

> Descartes suggests that we … need a distinction between those features of the wax that can change without the wax ceasing to be wax, and those that are so essential that, without them, it would no longer be wax at all.[37]

Once we rid our analysis of the empirical qualities that change then we are left with its essential qualities: "at that point [of removing inessential qualities of the wax], we would realize that nothing remains expect something that is extended, flexible, and changeable."[38] In this way, the same properties that are applied to a particular object can also be applied to a variety of others. As the same qualities and properties of an object remain through the structure, an object can be correctly understood despite its transformation in experience. This can be seen in Clarke's relation of the *Meditations*' wax example to Descartes' discussion of a stone in the *Principles of Philosophy* (1644): "A similar analysis of what is essential to a stone, in the Principles, concludes that 'nothing remains in the idea of the stone except that it is something extended in length, breadth, and depth."[39] Yet it must be noted that "[it] is not the same question that is addressed in the Principles, where Descartes argues that there is one principal attribute of every substance."[40] The realisation of the mind's mediation of experience also reflects the earlier discovery in Meditation Two of the cogito*:* "I am … precisely nothing but a thinking thing; that is, a mind, or intellect, or understanding, or reason – words whose meanings I was previously

---

discover the principles that give structure to experience in order for a scientific method to be developed that would enable greater understanding of the world. Whilst Hegel's understanding negates experience completely in order to express the world as an expression of the mind.

[37] Desmond M. Clarke, *Descartes' Theory of Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) p.218

[38] Ibid

[39] Ibid

[40] Ibid, p.219

ignorant."[41] An individual is precisely not a collection of empirical qualities but a thinking thing, a collection of various thought processes, which enable understanding to take place. In other words, an individual is not a collection of empirical properties that change over time but a collection of rational principles that are universal and eternally true.

Therefore it is with the discovery of timeless truths through the use of deductive reason that the *Meditations* is comparable to the *Rules*. It is through the use of deductive reason that universality is created for knowledge through the act of meditation itself. The act of meditation replaces the prior set of rules and enables an individual to transcend the conflict of qualities in our experience and reflect upon the truth. It is through the discovery of pure truths through meditation that a singular Cartesian apprenticeship is developed and affirmed. Here, an individual is self-taught and not allow others to determine their understanding. We must come to understanding for our self. In doing so, we are able to discover the timeless principles that underlie various disciplines and fields. These principles then provide a foundation upon which knowledge can be applied universally for all individuals. Others can then test the validity of these universal principles. A principle (the cogito) is true if all others can universally reflect upon it. If not, then it cannot serve as a universal principle.

This rationalist apprenticeship based upon the reflection of transcendent sign is critically discussed in Thomas Hobbes' 4th objection to Descartes' *Meditations*.

[41] Rene Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, p.19

Hobbes illustrates the problem in our ability to reflect upon a concept of the mind such as the cogito. This is because the idea remains blank. Comparable to Locke, we must be able to make sense of an idea by attributing worldly qualities to it. Hobbes' view is then challenged by the contemporary Cartesian linguistic philosophy of Chomsky. Chomsky argues that language is based upon a deep grammar, namely, that there is a natural innate way in which sentences are constructed even if they are nonsensical. The way we make sense is not based upon our imagination but through our innate use of grammar.

Hobbes' objection: the imagination as an empirical process of making sense

Hobbes' 4th objection to Descartes' is that reflection upon transcendent signifiers such as the cogito remains empirical. This is because we must make sense and imagine the qualities of any idea: "There is a tremendous difference between imagining (that is, having some idea) and conceiving with the mind (that is, concluding by a process of reasoning that something is or exists). But M. Descartes has not explained to us the basis for their being different."[42] In contrast to Descartes, a mind cannot reflect upon the pure universal properties of an object. This is because, without a process of association, the mind's idea of an object remains blank: "… the ancient peripatetic philosophers have taught clearly enough that a substance is not perceived by the senses but is inferred by means of arguments … [but] were reasoning perhaps merely the joining together and linking of names or

[42] Rene Descartes, *Meditations, Objections and Replies*, ed. and trans. by Roger Ariew and Donald Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2006) p.104

designations by the means of the word 'is'? It would follow from this that we draw no conclusions whatever by way of argument about the nature of things.[43]

We are then faced with a problem in defining an object based on pure reason since there would be no way to distinguish or differentiate objects. In being unable to be differentiated, ideas remain conflated and impossible to define. In order for us to be able to define and distinguish objects the empirical act of association must be affirmed. This is because it is through the process of imagination that we can associate various experiential qualities to an idea: "… reasoning will depend upon names, names upon imagination, and imagination perhaps, as I see it upon the motions of the corporeal organs."[44]

This enables meaning to be established for an object through the attribution of a name: "… it is about the designation of things that we draw any conclusions, that is, whether or not we in fact join the names of things in accordance with some convention that we have arbitrarily established regarding the meanings of these terms."[45] Hobbes is here critical of Descartes' use of rational concepts in the *Meditations*. In Descartes' attribution of a name to an idea of the mind negates its purity. Purity of the concepts such as the *cogito* remains negated since their name remains empirical. In this case, the use of Latin for denoting a concept is made only once it has been understood in an empirical context. Descartes' prior discussion of empirical qualities of the wax or the body is therefore crucial to the formation of the

[43] Ibid
[44] Ibid, pp.104-5
[45] Ibid

creation of a rationalist concept. Without this prior discussion of the empirical qualities an individual would not be able to reach the same conclusions since they would not be able to form a clear idea of it.

Descartes' reply to Hobbes reiterates that languages are united by signs and not names: "… in reasoning there is a joining together not of names but of things signified by these names … for who doubts that a Frenchman and a German could come to precisely the same conclusions about the very same things, even though they conceive very different words?"[46] By reflecting on a sign, we are able to rationally reflect on the universal properties of an object. Despite differences in languages everyone can reflect upon the same properties. This demonstrates the transcendent foundation of knowledge is accessible through reason and, with this, an apprenticeship to knowledge is affirmed. This is because we are always able to reflect upon the same ideas, regardless of our social or cultural backgrounds or time period. Edwin Curley relates Descartes' reply to the prior argument in Meditation Six of the limitation of our imagination:

> There is … [an] argument in Hobbes[' objections] for the inconceivability of a nonextended subject … to have an idea or conception of a thing is to have an image of it; but every image is necessarily the image of some extended thing; so lacking an image of any nonextended thing, we cannot conceive it.[47]

Yet Hobbes' argument is not satisfactory for Curley because:

[46] Ibid, p.105
[47] Edwin Curley, 'Hobbes versus Descartes' in Roger Ariew and Marjorie Green (eds.), *Descartes and His Contempories: Meditations, Objections and Replies* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1995) p.104

> In the Sixth Meditation Descartes presents an argument for making a distinction between an idea and an image: we have an idea of a chiliagon which is completely distinct from the idea we have of any other polygon … but the image we have of a chiliagon is not distinct from the images we have of many other polygons; therefore, we must make a distinction between having an idea of something and having an image of it.[48]

Despite attempting to resolve Hobbes' critical remarks, Descartes further problematizes them by negating language in preference to the sign. In other words, how can language emerge if the essence of the idea, a sign, is privileged over words? Using Hobbes argument, an empirical language is based on qualities of an object that is necessary in order to form an idea of it. In response to Curley's critical remarks an idea cannot be distinguished from its image. For Hobbes, in contrast to Descartes, a name is not devoid of knowledge altogether. A name is affirmative of the prior process of forming an idea of the various experiential associations of an object. A name for an individual is able to reflect an apprenticeship where knowledge is gained through a material engagement with the world. This is not to represent a pure essence but a multiplicity of different qualities. In contrast to Descartes, each different quality would be affirmed rather than negated under the same sign. For instance, in forming an idea of a person, another individual would associate their various qualities, nice/bad hair, good/bad teeth and so forth as a collection of properties which co-exist in a given name. A Cartesian approach would negate all these various empirical qualities in preference to the same transcendent property of a *cogito*. Therefore without affirming these qualities of an object the sign is blank.

[48] Ibid

The sign is blank since it affirms a transcendent basis for meaning devoid of any worldly qualities. Language then takes on a secondary role in order to reveal the essence of objects. Whilst in Hobbes' objection to Descartes, language has a primary role since it is a reflection of knowledge itself.

Chomsky and Cartesian Linguistics: the mind as a grammatical foundation

A problem with Hobbes' view emerges, however, if a syntactic structure is applied to names. This is because the organisation of each word has an importance to the way individuals are able to understand each other. A collection of names arranged in any order is nonsensical but arranged according to a grammatical order can be universally understood. A Cartesian foundation for language can be affirmed through the necessity of gaining understanding through a universal syntactic structure. A modern Cartesian theory of language which emphasises a universal syntactic foundation for language has been developed by Noam Chomsky in *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought* (1966).

For Chomsky, an individual's mind is the site of a grammatical structure which enables the creative (and rational) use of language: "Pursuing the fundamental distinction between body and mind, Cartesian linguistics characteristically assumes that language has two aspects …"[49] The first aspect of Cartesian linguistics is study a sentence from its empirical qualities: "… A sentence can be studied … from the point of view of its physical shape, that is, from the point of view of … [its] phonetic

[49] Noam Chomsky, *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought,* 3rd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) p.79

interpretation …"[50] In grammatical terms, the empirical or surface structure of language is the various sounds that an individual makes when denoting a word. In order to pronounce words individuals are dependent on a variety of empirical qualities such as their tongue, teeth and voice box. It is by using a semantic structure for language that individuals assume that coherence is achieved grammatically. However, for Chomsky, a grammatical structure or correct syntactic sentence structure cannot be solely determined by an analysis of its phonetics. This is because a phonetic structure by itself affirms a nonsensical combination of language.

Chomsky's proof of this can be found in his example of colorless green ideas sleep furiously from his earlier work *Syntactic Structure* (1957):

> … the notion 'grammatical' cannot be identified with 'meaningful' or 'significant' in any semantic sense. Sentences (1) and (2) are equally nonsensical, but any speaker of the English language will recognise that only the former is grammatical.
>
> (1) Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.
> (2) Furiously sleep ideas green colourless.
>
> … Such examples suggest that any search for a semantically based definition of 'grammaticalness' will be futile.[51]

[50] Ibid
[51] Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002) p.15

It is clear from the sentence structure provided that the second example is a complete jumble of words. Or as John Collins describes, "[its] just word salad"[52]. This is because the sentence is without any given structure in which an individual can clearly understand it. The only way in which the words make sense is in a list of words without any necessary relation to each other: "… the pronunciation of [2] has a flat intonation contour, as if one was merely listing a string of words."[53] What then prevents the first sentence, colorless green ideas sleep furiously, from not also reading as a list of words? In other words, what is it about the first sentence that makes it a structure in which an individual can understand what is being said in a way that the second example lacks? This lack of understanding can be seen in attempting to analyse the sentence empirically: "… [Empirically] only animate things can sleep … ideas are abstract and only concrete things can be green. Further, it is contradictory to describe a thing as both green and colourless, and it is wholly opaque how anything can sleep in a furious manner."[54] A reason the first sentence retains understanding is because the sentence affirms a variety of grammatical functions whilst second sentence does not. In other words, a grammatical structure is adhered to because it is through the comprehension by an individual's mind of empirical contradictions of colourless and green, furious and sleeping which demonstrate a deep structure at work.

Collins elaborates:

> [1] smoothly admits to various grammatical operations that [2] precludes: For example …

[52] John Colllins, *Chomsky: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Continuum, 2008) p.41
[53] Ibid
[54] Ibid, p.42

a. Colourless green ideas do sleep furiously. [emphasis]
b. Colourless green ideas don't sleep furiously. [negation]
c. Do Colourless green ideas sleep furiously? [interrogative]

… [unlike Chomsky's second example] we can freely change the tense, aspect and modality [of the first sentence] with no change in its relative acceptability. All this suggests that we are dealing with a perfectly well-formed structure.[55]

For Chomsky, a phonetic incapacity to express the underlying mental understanding of the ideas that are expressed demonstrates the deep structure of the mind which provides a correct grammatical structure for language:

> "The surface structure resulting from these transformations does not directly express the meaning relations of the words, of course, except in the simplest cases. It is the deep structure underlying the actual utterance, a structure that is purely mental … [this] constitutes an underlying mental reality – *a mental accompaniment to the utterance* – whether or not the surface form of the utterance that is produced corresponds to it in a simple, point-by-point manner."[56]

That is, there is an underlying grammatical structure for the construction of phonetic sentences. This underlying structure, or deep structure, can only be explained through the mind and not through experience. An example of the deep

[55] Ibid
[56] Noam Chomsky, *Cartesian Linguistics*, pp.80-1 – italics have been added for emphasis.

grammatical structure Chomsky provides is the sentence: “The doctrine which identifies the sovereign good with the sensual pleasure of the body, which was taught by Epicurus, is unworthy of a philosopher.”[57] The aspect in which deep structure is identified is through the mind’s capacity to associate the idea of goodness with the sensual pleasure of the body: “the complex phrase containing the restrictive relative clause and its antecedent expresses a single complex idea formed from the two ideas of a doctrine and of identifying the sovereign good with the sensual pleasure of the body. All this information must be represented in the deep structure of the original sentence.”[58] The idea of sensual goodness is not implied by the body itself. In scientific terms, the body is a composition of organs, tissue and blood. In this way, the idea of a good body or a sensually good body is only conceived of by the mind. This image that is constructed by their mind is then applied to their own bodies.

In the final chapter of *Cartesian Linguistics* Chomsky applies the deep structure of grammar to the process of learning a first language, as Alan Nelson explains “Chomsky argues that humans’ knowledge of their first language exceeds the experiential base available to them … [due to this Chomsky argues that] part of the process of first language learning … must depend on an innate structure.”[59] For Chomsky, an experiential basis serves to explain the acquisition of language by a child in a certain period of time and in certain conditions: “… language acquisition is a matter of growth and maturation of relatively fixed capacities, under appropriate

[57] Ibid, p.82
[58] Ibid
[59] Alan Nelson, ‘Cartesian Innateness’ in *A Companion to Descartes*, ed. by Janet Broughton and John Carriero (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011) p.331

external conditions."[60] However it does not explain the form of language, namely not as an expression of nonsense but capable of expressing ideas: "The form of that is acquired is largely determined by internal factors; it is because of the fundamental correspondence of all human languages … that a child can learn any language."[61] That is, as the same idea is reflected despite a transformation of language, a child can learn any language. For instance, this can be seen in the process in learning another language. As the same idea is reflected through a different word an individual is able to understand the word and also be able to use it in a sentence that is syntactically correct.

In other words, a child cannot learn by mere reflection but is dependent on a correct learning environment. This environment is extremely important as it allows for a greater potential of unleashing their innate linguistic abilities, as he states "… the basic structure of language and principles that determine the form and interpretation of sentences are in large part innate. But it does not follow that emphasis on language development is misplaced. If a child is placed in an impoverished environment, innate abilities will not develop, mature and flourish."[62] Far from being able to comprehend language and ideas in isolation, an experiential relationship in order to develop the capacities of an individual's mind. It is through the correct environmental stimulation that these capacities will flourish. This state is described as "a stimulating environment … to enable natural curiosity, intelligence, and creativity to develop, and to encourage our biological capacities to unfold."[63] Without this experiential relationship an individual's mental capacity will remain in an

[60] Noam Chomsky, *Cartesian Linguistics*, p.101
[61] Ibid, pp.101-2
[62] Lillian R. Putnam and Noam Chomsky, 'An Interview with Noam Chomsky', *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Dec., 1994 - Jan., 1995) p.331
[63] Ibid, p.332

undeveloped state. In this way, an individual will be unable to fulfil their potential and enable their capacities to flourish. An example of this state is where "… a child [having been] brought up in an institution may have ample experience and nutrition, but still may not develop normally, either physically or mentally, if normal human interaction is lacking."[64]

Chomsky therefore affirms a Cartesian foundation for language since it is the innate grammatical structure of the mind that enables a clear and distinct image from what is being communicated. If ideas are arbitrarily arranged in a nonsensical order then a mind is unable to reflect upon the ideas that are contained in the sentence. In contrast to Hobbes, without the capacity of a mind, a phonetic structure of a sentence is a collection of sounds. These collections of sounds do not have any structure and so lack the capacity to express an idea. This leads into problems for an empirical apprenticeship since there would no grammatical structure underlying a sentence. Due to this, an individual would find it impossible to understand and make sense of what was being stated. For Chomsky, it is only through a Cartesian apprenticeship that enables knowledge to be affirmed. This is because *the intellect enables the correct arrangement of phonetic qualities in order for a clear idea to emerge*. In other words, the phonetic properties of sentence reflect a sign. It is the sign and not words themselves that are reflected upon in order for understanding to take place. A universal basis for knowledge is affirmed despite a change in language itself.

[64] Ibid, p.331

Another contemporary linguist William Labov challenges Chomsky's Cartesian idea of deep grammar. This is because Labov's approach takes into account and demonstrates how worldly forces affect language. He notes the tonal variances of an utterance based upon the environment, social and cultural influences. Therefore through the opposing viewpoints of Hobbes and Labov show how the transcendent sign cannot be separated from immanent forces. The importance of these forces is that they affirm novel differences such as social and cultural differences. My discussion of Deleuze and Guattari then highlights the problems of racism in a rationalist viewpoint. The problem of racism occurs through the negation of the importance of the unique expressions of individual by having them to conform to a universal standard.

William Labov and sociolinguistics: an immanent foundation for language

William Labov in *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (1972) studies the different uses of languages by various groups of individuals in society. The everyday variants of speech are considered to be essential for any understanding of language. This is because an individual cannot understand the structure of language independently from phonetics, as Labov remarks "… the basis of intersubjective knowledge in linguistics must be found in speech – language as it is used in everyday life by members of the social order, that vehicle of communication in which they argue with their wives, joke with their friends, and deceive their enemies."[65] This analysis of everyday language is not focused on a transcendent metaphysics but its immanent transformation: "… one cannot understand the development of a language change

[65] William Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991) p. xiii

apart from the social life of the community in which it occurs. Or to put it another way, social pressures are continually operating upon language, not from some remote point in the past, but as an immanent social force in the living present."[66] Comparable to Hobbes' criticism of Descartes, it is from a phonetic understanding of language that enables an idea to be based on various experiential associations. In this case, the variety of social communities and pressures effect language in a dynamic way. This can be seen in the variety of different ways an individual transforms their speech depending on the social context. As Labov's method seeks to analyse an immanent transformation of language a historical analysis of this change acts as a limitation: "it seems that a historical approach is more appropriate to an empirical science concerned with change, even over a narrow time span … at the same time, such a close view of historical change makes us extremely sceptical of the value of limitations on the kinds of data which may be considered."[67]

In order to study the variation of language based on a historical analysis only specific sets of data can be used. This limits the variations itself to a generality. In limiting variation to generality it could be argued that linguistic change only occurs in epochs of time. Yet Labov's aim is to study the immanent transformation of speech a dynamic approach must be used in order to affirm the variation itself: "one would expect that the application of structural linguistics to diachronic problems would lead to the enrichment of the data, rather than the impoverishment of it."[68] A singular method is rejected by Labov in preference to adoption of various techniques, as R. A. Hudson notes: "[Labov's] most general answer [to studying the variation of

[66] Ibid, p.4
[67] Ibid, p.3
[68] Ibid

language] is that we should use as many different methods as possible, preferring results which are supported by them all."[69] In adopting a variety of techniques, a chaotic method is not affirmed as a consistent set of results is able to be obtained. Hudson gives further insight into the general techniques of how data is gathered: ".... investigators focus on a predetermined list of *linguistic variables* – elements which are known in advance to have different realisations, such as words which have more than one pronunciation … For each variable, there is a list of *variants* – the alternative forms known to be used – and the investigator goes through a collection of data noting which variants were used for each variant in the list."[70] The collection of linguistic data then interpreted by the investigator where it is quantified and made into a set of statistics.

An example of Labov's method can be seen in his study entitled 'The Social Stratification of (r) in New York department stores'. Labov's hypothesis was to: "… test two ideas … first, the variable (r) is a social differentiator in all levels of New York City speech; and the second, that casual and anonymous and speech events could be used as the basis for a systematic study of language."[71] The experiment was conducted in November 1962 where he studied the speech of staff members from three different department stores. The stores chosen were representative of three areas of society. The first, Saks Fifth Avenue was in a high fashion district, sold expensive goods and had high prestige. The second, Macy's, was in a garment district, sold middle range price goods and had average prestige. The last, Klein's,

[69] R. A. Hudson, *Sociolinguistics*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) p.146
[70] Ibid
[71] William Labov, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) p.40

was in the working class district of the Lower East Side, sold cheaply priced goods and had little prestige. Labov asked various store assistants from each store either to inform him of the location of goods that he knew were on the fourth floor. The responses given by the store assistants was either “on the fourth floor” or “the fourth floor”. The question was then repeated by Labov to note the variance by the store assistant in their second emphatic reply. The investigation itself was done by noting the responses in secret and without the store assistant’s knowledge: “the exchange was a normal salesman-customer interaction, almost below the level of conscious attention, in which relations of the speakers were so casual and anonymous that they hardly have been said to have met.”[72]

The results from the three department stores confirmed that: “… (r) stratification is an integral part of the linguistic structure of New York City speech community … [this] should terminate any suspicion that the pronunciation of [the variance of r] in New York City is limited to a narrow group of speakers, or that it is a phenomenon which occurs only in the presence of linguistics and speech teachers.”[73] Linguistic variance cannot be limited to a specific set of speakers because there are numerous individual characteristics were included in the test. The classification of these characteristics allow for a comparison with other data. The data that was compared was an individual’s sex, estimated age, occupation within the store, race, and if they were foreign or had any regional accent. From this data it could be argued that a homogenous system of language is created a universality of the variance is evident within all speakers. However, *the linguistic variances of each*

[72] Ibid, p.46
[73] Ibid, p.56

class prevents a homogeneous system from arising. This can be seen in Labov's comparison between linguistic data which notes the variables within each classification.

For instance, Labov observed that it was native female New York workers who use the highest amount of variance: "the stratification of (r) is a property of the most homogeneous sub-group in the three stores: native New York, white, saleswomen."[74] However, the variance is effected by the location of the store. In the comparison of data between Macy's and Saks: "… a total of 62 percent of Saks employees used all or some of [r-1] (emphatic second pronunciation), 51 percent of Macys …[from this we can see that] In the emphatic pronunciation of the final (r), Macy's employees come very close to the mark set by marks. It would seem that r-pronunciation is the norm at which a majority of employees aim, yet not the one they use most often."[75] Whilst the employees at the Lower East Side store, Kleins, which had the lowest amount of emphatic difference with only "… 21 percent"[76]

A reason for the higher variance in Saks than in Macy's or Kleins is due to the different management of each store where: "… In Macy's, the employees who were interviewed could be identified as floorwalkers (by red and white carnations), sales people, cashiers, stockboys, and elevator operators. In Saks, the cashiers are not accessible to the customer, working behind sales counters, and stockboys are not

[74] Ibid, p.47
[75] Ibid
[76] Ibid

seen."[77] This displayed the greatest use of variance in Macy's were by the floorwalkers and sales people: "the floorwalkers and sales people are almost the same in percentage of those who use all or some of (r-1), but the floorwalkers have a much higher percentage of those who consistently use (r-1)."[78] With the lack of a shared working environment and greater amount of sales assistants available in Saks gives evidence for their increase in use of their variance: "The ground floor of Saks looks very much like Macy's … salesgirls leaning over the counters … a great deal of merchandise displayed. But the upper floors of Saks are far more spacious; there are long vistas of empty carpeting, and on the floors devoted to high fashion, there are models who display the individual garments to the customers."[79]

Therefore there is a crucial relationship between language and environment that emerges from Labov's analysis. A different working environment has a direct effectual relation to an individual's expression. This is where an individual's language becomes an expression of the environment itself. As Labov remarks "The executives of the prestige stores pay a great deal of attention to employee relations, and take many unusual measures to ensure that the sales people feel that they share in the general prestige of the store."[80] This embodiment of the store's prestige can be seen in the case of an individual from the Lower East Side who worked at Saks: "One of the Lower East Side informants who worked at Saks was chiefly impressed with the fact that she could buy Saks clothes at a 25 percent discount. A similar concession from a lower prestige store would have been of little interest to her."[81]

[77] Ibid, p.50
[78] Ibid, p.51
[79] Ibid, pp.51-2
[80] Ibid, p.44
[81] Ibid

Due to this effect by the environment on an individual's expression, a homogeneous system for language cannot take place since it would negate the very empirical elements that form the basis for their expression. As Anne Sauvagnargues states "[Labov] maintains that not only do the idiolects in New York City not form a homogeneous system, but they also show the idea of a homogeneous system of linguistics to be inconsistent."[82] A homogeneous system attempts to negate these qualities in order to emphasize the same idea that is portrayed throughout each phonetic variance. This is to negate the immanent qualities of language that Labov classifies such as, accents and variance between sexes. However, Labov's method demonstrates that immanent qualities have a direct effect on an individual's language. Comparable to Hobbes criticism of Descartes, the idea or sign that is reflected upon in Chomsky's method remains blank. This is because without these experiential qualities an idea remains in a purely metaphysical state. It is therefore through immanent experiential forces that enables meaning to occur within each linguistic variance. Meaning is then not destroyed altogether into nonsense through these immanent differences. This is because meaning is affirmed as a multiplicity of immanent forces.

Deleuze and Guattari on Chomsky and Labov: linguistic variables and African American English

In *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980) Deleuze and Guattari highlight a crucial difference between Chomsky and Labov based on their treatment of linguistic variables: "Chomsky asks only that one carve from this aggregate a homogeneous or standard system as a basis for abstraction or idealisation, making possible a scientific study of

[82] Anne Sauvagnargues, *Deleuze and Art* trans. by Samantha Bankston (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013) p.106

principles …"[83] As we have seen in Chomsky's privileging of a Cartesian apprenticeship linguistics variables or various phonetic qualities represent a sign. A sign is representative of the mind's capacity to understand the idea that is expressed in a phonetic structure. However, due to Chomsky's dependence on a homogenous system in order to account for all language, a problem emerges, namely, how do minor variations of the standard form of English also enable the same knowledge and ideas to emerge? This problem emerges in relation to a discussion of Black English where for Deleuze and Guattari, Chomsky still adheres to a homogeneous system that negates phonetic variables: "limiting oneself to standard English is thus not the issue or the English of the ghettos is obliged to extract a standard system guaranteeing the constancy and homogeneity of the object under study …"[84] In Chomsky's view, the variables and variations of Black English do not affect the overall structure of the English language. This is because the minor language of Black English still adheres to the same ideas that are expressed in the standard form of English, as he argues "…Black English is simply a language on par with my urban Philadelphia dialect of English, the English of High Table at Oxford, Japanese, Greek, etc. … The idea that Black English … or any other language fails to provide to an adequate basis for abstract thinking is utterly implausible, and I think one should be extremely sceptical about claims to the contrary."[85] However, in order not to suffer the disadvantages of adhering to a minor language the dominant standard of a society should be taught in order to assist a child to function in the world: "… the speakers of a language …should probably be taught in their own language at the very early stages, until basic skills are acquired, and should be taught in the

[83] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* trans. by Brian Massumi (London: Continuum, 2004) p.103
[84] Ibid
[85] Lillian R. Putnam and Noam Chomsky, 'An Interview with Noam Chomsky', p.332

dominant language at the later stages, so that they can enter society without suffering the disadvantages that are rooted in the prevailing power, privilege, and domination."[86]

For Deleuze and Guattari, a reason that minor variations of a language will not be seen as part of a homogenous system can be seen in Chomsky's criticism of the interpretation of variables where Labov's emphasis on phonetics through the collection of linguistic data is not based on an analysis of language but pragmatics: "… Chomsky pretends to believe that by asserting his interest in the variable features of language, Labov is situating himself in a de facto pragmatics external to linguistics."[87] In other words, an individual's beliefs in the interpretation of data lies outside the analysis of language itself. As Chomsky remarks "language documentation requires linguistic theory … when I was a student, the work that we did as students was language documentation … But the data you were looking for was dependent on what linguistic theory tells you to look for … [and] the kind of data you look for depends on what you think exists, what you think is important."[88] That is, in a subjective approach, the data that will be selected will be biased according to their beliefs. This calls into question the initial process of a selection of candidates where an individual's focus will not solely be on their language structure but on the different pragmatic structures in society. Following the collection of data, the pragmatic structures of society and beliefs of the individual will enviably cloud the overall outcome will be contrived. A subjective bias can then be overcome through

[86] Ibid, p.333
[87] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p.103
[88] Noam Chomsky, 'Language and the Cognitive Science Revolution(s)' Carleton University, April 8th 2011 transcript by David P. Wilkins, http://www.chomsky.info/talks/20110408.htm [date accessed 12th August 2013]. The full lecture can be accessed at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XbjVMq0k3uc uploaded by the official youtube account of Carleton University.

an analysis of the linguistic theory in itself. For Chomsky, language is dependent on the linguistic theory that determines an individual's beliefs. It is through the adherence to the same structural system that demonstrates an individual does not affect transform language itself. In this way, language is not transformed through each differing variable or data that is gathered since it is demonstrative of the same homogeneous structure.

In contrast to Chomsky who seeks to homogenise the minor variations of language, Deleuze and Guattari note that: "Labov … has other ambitions … When he brings to light lines of *inherent variation*, he does not see them simply as 'free variants' pertaining to pronunciation, style, or nonpertinent features that lie outside the system and leave the homogeneity of the system in tact; neither does he see them as a de facto mix between two systems …"[89] That is, Labov does not analyse each linguistic variation as a reflection of the same homogeneous structure of English. Nor is each variance perceived as minor language that mixes with a major standard of English. This is because the immanent qualities of the linguistic variances would be negated under a generalisation. This is where the unique qualities of a variance such as its pronunciation and style are negated in preference to the standard structure of English. In negating these immanent qualities the structure of English language would therefore act as an absolute foundation for how all subsequent uses of language and its variances should be expressed.

[89] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p.103

Deleuze and Guattari argue that in order to affirm these immanent qualities Labov seeks to maintain the uniqueness of linguistic variation: “it is the variation itself that is systematic …Labov sees variation as a dejure component affecting each system from within, sending it cascading or leaping on its own power and forbidding one to close it off, to make it homogeneous in principle.”[90] That is, a variation is not a heterogeneous form of language that continually transforms and so prevents any system of language from emerging. On the contrary, a variation has its own set of unique set of linguistic systematic properties. By having its own set of systematic properties enables it to deviate from the standard form of English and become its own form of language. A different problem is therefore formed from Labov’s treatment of linguistic variations, namely, how do minor variations demonstrate a new linguistic system that affects and transforms the knowledge and ideas of the standard form of English? For Deleuze and Guattari, this problem also emerges in relation to a discussion of Black English: “[Labov] takes the example of a young black person who, in a very short series of phrases, seems to pass from the Black English system to the standard eighteen times.”[91]

Labov’s analysis of Black English occurs in in *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (1972) where he seeks to problematize the use of applying a standard English grammatical structure to Black English Vernacular. The term of Black English Vernacular has been chosen by Labov in order to avoid a generalisation of Black language: “’Black English’ might be best used for the whole range of language forms used by black people in the United

[90] Ibid
[91] Ibid

States: a very large range indeed, extending from the Creole grammar of Fullah spoken in the Sea Islands of South Carolina to the most and accomplished literary style."[92] The term has also been used in order to avoid the division between standard English and Black English: "the term 'black English' is not suitable for this dialect since that phrase implies a dichotomy between Standard English on the one hand and black English on the other."[93] Labov defines Black English Vernacular as "the relatively uniform dialect spoken by the majority of black youth in most parts of the United States today, especially in the inner city areas [such as] New York, Boston, Detroit, Philadelphia, Washington … it is also spoken in most rural areas and used in the causal, intimate speech of many adults …"[94] The age group which is analysed that displayed the most consistent form of Black English vernacular is "… found in its most consist form in the speech of black youth from 8 to 19 years old who fully participate in the street cultures of the inner cities."[95]

A problem in application of an English grammatical structure to Black English vernacular can be seen in an attempt to correct a student's misuse of language: "when the teacher attempts to [teach 'standard English' to an African American student] by precept and example in the classroom, she discovers that the student shows a strong and inexplicable resistance to learning the few simple rules that he needs to know."[96] An example of this resistance is the lack of use of past tense in sentence structure: "He is told over and over again, from the early grades to the twelfth, that *–ed* is required for the past participle ending, but he continues to write: 'I

[92] William Labov, *Language in The Inner Cities: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972) p.xiii
[93] Ibid
[94] Ibid
[95] Ibid
[96] Ibid, p.4

have live here twelve years.' And he continues to mix up past and present tense forms in his reading."[97] A reason that Labov gives for the student's failure to adhere to the correct grammatical style is due to a teacher's failure to recognise different structural rules that operate within Black English Vernacular: "… the child's teacher has no systematic knowledge of the nonstandard forms which oppose and contradict standard English … [due to this] they look upon every deviation from schoolroom English as inherently evil, and they attribute these mistakes to laziness, sloppiness or the child's natural disposition to be wrong."[98] In this view, the imposition of English grammar structure is to provide a structure to language that did not exist in the student's language: "From this point of view, teaching English is a question of imposing rules upon chaotic and shapeless speech, filling a vacuum by supplying rules where no rules existed before."[99] However, not all teachers adopt this view and are interest the student's language but fail to properly understand its structure: "Other teachers are sincerely interested in understanding the language of the children, but their knowledge is fragmentary and ineffective. They feel that the great difficulties in teaching black and Puerto Rican children are due in part to the systematic contradictions used by the child and the rules used by the teacher."[100]

Following this, Labov seeks to understand why Black English Vernacular is not recognised as its own form of the English language. A reason for this is identified from the analysis of the African-American children by educational psychologists: "… a great deal of federally sponsored research has been devoted to the educational

[97] Ibid
[98] Ibid
[99] Ibid, p.5
[100] Ibid

problems of children in ghetto schools. In order to account for the poor performance of children in these schools, educational psychologists have attempted to discover what kind of disadvantage or defect they are suffering from."[101] Educational psychologists identified this disadvantage as the student's impoverished background: "the viewpoint that has been widely accepted … is that children show a cultural deficit as a result of an impoverished environment in their early years."[102] This serves as a foundation for explaining black children's incorrect use of grammar: "Considerable attention has been given to language. In this area the deficit theory appears as the concept of verbal deprivation. Black children from the ghetto area are said to receive little verbal stimulation, to hear very little well-formed language, and as a result are impoverished in their means of verbal expression ..."[103] This can be seen in the view of Martin Deutsch in *The Disadvantaged Child* (1967) and *Social Class, Race and Psychological Development* (1968) as Labov notes: "… the notion of cultural deprivation put forward by Martin Deutsch and others … Black children are said to lack the favorable factors in their home environment which enable middle-class children to do well in school."[104] Some of these factors are "… the development of various cognitive skills through verbal interaction with adults, including the ability to reason abstractly, speak fluently, and focus upon long-range goals."[105]

An extreme case of this deprivation is to adopt the view that African American English is not a language. This view is present in the technique of Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Engelmann in *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in Preschool* (1966) as

[101] Ibid, p.201
[102] Ibid
[103] Ibid
[104] Ibid, p.204
[105] Ibid

Labov states: “Bereiter’s program for an academically oriented preschool is based upon the premise that black children must have a language with which they can learn, and their empirical finding that these children come to school without such a language.”[106] Instead of using a standard form of communication: “… Bereiter reports that their communication was by gestures, ‘single words,’ and ‘a series of badly connected words or phrases,’ such as *They mine* and *Me got juice* … Thus Bereiter concludes that the children’s speech forms are nothing more than a series of emotional cries, and decides to treat them [without any form of language at all].”[107] In order for children to learn a correct standard: “[Bereiter’s] basic program is … to teach [African American children] a new language devised by Engelmann, which consists of a limited series of questions and answers …”[108] A problem with Bereiter’s approach is that the questions are framed in such a way that the answers given by a child is “… defensive, [and displays] monosyllabic behavior.”[109] This leads to the creation of “[an] asymmetrical situation [for the child] where anything he says can literally be held against him. He has learned a number of devices to avoid saying anything in this situation, and he works very hard to achieve this end.”[110]

Labov challenges this view of African American English as an inferior language due to cultural deprivation: “The concept of verbal deprivation has no basis in social reality. In fact, black children in the urban ghettos receive a great deal of verbal stimulation, hear more well-formed sentences than middle-class children, and

[106] Ibid, pp.204-5
[107] Ibid, p.205
[108] Ibid
[109] Ibid, p.206
[110] Ibid

participate fully in a highly verbal culture."[111] From an analysis of African American English in a social environment demonstrates that an impoverished background does not lead to the incorrect use of English grammar. This is because the ghettos provide a stimulating environment for language development: "the view of the black speech community which we obtain from our work in the ghetto areas is precisely the opposite from that reported by Deutsch, Bereiter and Engelmann. We see a child bathed in verbal stimulation from morning to night ... We see the younger child trying to acquire these skills [of gaining social status through their use of language] from older children."[112] This stimulating environment is transposed to their schools where a contrast is identified with middle-class children with an affluent background who receive less stimulation: "… in many ways working-class speakers are more effective narrators, reasoners and debaters than many middle-class speakers [in high school and college] temporize, qualify, and lose their argument in a mass of irrelevant detail."[113]

As there remains no proof for cultural deprivation for a basing a claim for the inferiority of a language demonstrates that African American children: "… have the same basic vocabulary, possess the same capacity for conceptual learning, and use the same logic as anyone else who learns to speak and understand English."[114] This is because African American English has its own set of systematic rules that enable it to be defined as a language: "the deletion of the *is* or *are* in [African American English] is not the result of erratic or illogical behavior; it follows the same regular

[111] Ibid, p.201
[112] Ibid, pp.212-3
[113] Ibid, pp.213-4
[114] Ibid, p.201

rules as standard English contraction … the appropriate use of the deletion rule … requires a deep intimate knowledge of English grammar and phonology."[115] Knowledge of the grammatical rules of deletion remain oblivious to the speakers of a language: "such knowledge is not available for conscious inspection by native speakers."[116] These grammatical rules are therefore formed at a subconscious level: "… the adult or child who uses these rules must have formed at some level of psychological organization, clear concepts of tense marker, verb phrase, rule ordering, sentence embedding, pronoun, and many other grammatical categories which are essential parts of any logical system."[117]

Labov therefore argues: "If we do not accept the fact that [African-American English] has distinct rules of its own, we find that the speech of black children is a mass of errors and this has indeed been the tradition of early education research in this area."[118] Black English Vernacular must be accepted as its own form of English language. If it is not accepted as its own unique form of the English language then it systematic qualities are negated through the imposition of a homogeneous system of language. Yet these systematic qualities are not errors, inherently evil, a natural disposition to be wrong or display a child's laziness or natural disposition to be wrong. This is because Black English Vernacular has its own systematic qualities that enable it to function as a form of language and differentiate it from the standard form of English. It is the systematic differences, such as the lack of a past tense that must be affirmed. On the other hand, if African American English is not affirmed as a

[115] Ibid, p.223
[116] Ibid
[117] Ibid
[118] Ibid, p.36

unique language then it leads into a view that it is inferior and defective compared to standard English. Yet to privilege the status of one language above another is dangerous since it can lead to racism: “the myth of verbal deprivation is particularly dangerous because it diverts attention from real defects of our educational system to imaginary defects of the child … it leads its sponsors inevitably to hypothesis of the genetic inferiority of black children that it was originally designed to avoid.”[119] The privileging of standard English is racist because African American English is treated as inferior and defective. This leads to the universal negation of all individuals who speak such language as inferior to those who use the standard form of English.

In comparison with the previous analysis of Chomsky’s view, both Chomsky and Labov agree that African American English is not an inferior form of standard English. For Chomsky, one language cannot be inferior since all languages seek to express the same ideas. In this way, African American English is equal to standard English because both would express the same ideas regardless of their phonetic variances. However, Chomsky’s view of African American English is problematized in using Labov’s method. This is because, for Labov, a homogeneous system negates the singular variances and differences that occur between languages. This does not mean that due to their differences one language is superior to another. On the contrary, it is because of their variations that enables it to be affirmed as a language in itself. If these variations are negated and a ‘standard’ grammatical form is used then it leads to a negative situation for a child. This is because any response that they give will be wrong if it is not based upon the prior determined structure.

[119] Ibid, p.202

However, the basis for using a universal form of grammar is flawed since an analysis of a social environment demonstrates the flourishing of a language. Labov's form of flourishing is not based upon an analysis of the correct environmental situation where a child can achieve their best potential. Instead, a child's capacity to flourish is not limited to any specific familial or class distinction. A language is not determined by generalisations but its variances are formed through worldly affects. In philosophical terms, Chomsky negates the immanent qualities of language that Labov seeks to affirm. In this negation of immanence, a pure rationalist philosophy of the mind is privileged. Whilst Labov, seeks to affirm language as being continually affected through worldly environment. It is therefore these immanent qualities that must be affirmed in order for a language to maintain its systematic differences.

Conclusion

For Deleuze and Guattari, Labov's method problematizes the relationship between speech and language in linguistic analysis:

> William Labov has clearly shown the contradiction, or at least paradox, created by the distinction between language and speech: language is defined as the 'social part' of language, and speech is consigned to individual variations; but since the social part is self-enclosed, it necessarily follows that a single individual would be enough to illustrate the principles of language

> without reference to any outside data, whereas speech could only be studied in a social context. The same paradox recurs from Saussure to Chomsky.[120]

In its initial analysis, language is social because it takes place in part of a worldly environment. Speech is affected by these processes which enables linguistic variances for each individual. However, a worldly environment is defined according to specific instances. In other words, the immanent qualities of language are defined according to specific cases and classifications that occur. The role of language is then reversed from having taken place in a worldly environment to a specific context. This context enables general principles and formulas to be created. These mathematical formulas are abstracted from the immanent forces that were initially taken into account. A single individual would then serve as a general basis on which these formulas could be tested. Speech is also transformed from an analysis of singular linguistic variances to an analysis of how speech is affected in a social context. The singular variances are then also generalized through an analysis of how they differ between different classifications, such as sex, age, and regional variation. A general variance can then be analyzed in order to note the overall difference between classes. However, this also leads to a negation of the immanent variations within each individual expression that was initially analyzed.

This problem can be seen in both methodologies of Chomsky and Labov. In Chomsky's method immanent processes and variances are negated in preference to a homogeneous system for language. Whilst in Labov, these immanent processes

[120] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p.576

are negated through their quantification. The process of quantification is necessary for Labov's method as it enables generalities and classifications to be created in order to analyze the variations that occur. It is within this context that variations are defined within social context, of sex, age, regional variation and so forth. Deleuze and Guattari therefore seek to affirm these initial immanent processes and the singular linguistic variations before their quantitative transformation into general formulas and their universal contextualization: "How can we conceptualize this continuous variation at work within a language, even if it means overstepping the limits Labov sets for himself as well as the conditions of scientificity invoked by linguistics?"[121] That is, Deleuze and Guattari seek to establish the concept of continuous variation as a continual becoming that always affects those generalities that are established through scientific method.

In relation to the study of sense and of meaning in my thesis, Deleuze and Guattari here assert that sense is a process that continually effects the establishment of meaning. Worldly forces condition the establishment of meaning. Yet these conditions remain in a state of becoming. This is due to the continual change in worldly forces (working environments, social and cultural conditions and so forth). Any establishment of causal or general principles can only remain transitory. It is by affirming worldly conditions as becoming that Deleuze and Guattari seek to overcome the problems of a transcendental or causal foundation that is apparent in the approaches of Chomsky and Labov. The danger in the establishment of transcendent or general foundations for language is the negation of uniqueness and singularity. This can be seen in their analysis of African American English. For

[121] Ibid, p.104

Deleuze and Guattari, we arrive at forms of institutional racism by negating the unique expression of a certain language. From this we can conclude that each individual's understanding is unique and affected by worldly forces. These forces remain in a continual state of becoming where any given generality is always conditioned by the analysis of a set of forces at a given time. We should then affirm the uniqueness of form and style of expression.

In the next chapter I develop the concept of a Leibnizian apprenticeship. This takes place through an analysis of the three stages of signs that occurs in *Proust and Signs*. Put briefly, worldly signs are the social and cultural basis for our knowledge. They provide structure and enable us to gain a basic understanding of the world. Signs of love challenge this foundation by enabling us to think of other perspectives, or in Leibnizian terms, other possible worlds. We then arrive at the last stage, signs of art that demonstrate the pure singularity of the world and the uniqueness of our understanding. After this, I return to the problems of dualism in Leibniz's philosophy and present an alternative approach based upon immanence, rather than, transcendence. The aim of the next chapter will then be to develop my initial analysis of Leibnizian philosophy that is based upon immanence, and its relation to epistemology and language.

4

Immanence and a Leibnizian apprenticeship to signs

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the concept of a Cartesian apprenticeship was defined. A rational apprenticeship was necessary for Descartes in order for individuals to use rational deduction to reflect upon a transcendent sign, the true form of an object. It was demonstrated that the construction of pure rational structures of the mind is dependent on worldly forces. This is because worldly forces implicitly influence our use of language. Examples of such worldly forces were the environmental and spatial effects on language shown in William Labov's analysis of the variance of the constant (r) in New York Department stores. Our use of language is dependent on worldly forces and not on an abstract value. This emphasises further the importance of rhetoric that was developed in Chapter One. An analysis of Nietzsche's early remarks on language identified that in the establishment of an origin for language, a specific transcendent value was privileged. This establishment of a transcendent value was necessary in order for the origin to be pure and truly original. A problem was then identified in cases of origins such that worldly forces were shown to influence the construction of a transcendent value. This collection of worldly forces gave an explanation for the difference between origins across cases, because the multiplicity of forces gave rise to different origins thereby denying their claims to be absolute foundations. This was also seen through in the various responses that were given to Labov, since each answer given was different due to the continual change

of tonal variance (r). This tonal variance was identified due to various factors at work such as an individual's age, sex, race, job, and the environmental space.

Building on this previous analysis, it can be said that from Deleuze's Nietzschean perspective that *sense is a singularity*. *This is because each individual's understanding is always different*. In order to define singularity we can adopt Max Stirner's usage from Chapter Two's discussion of *The Ego and Its Own*. For Stirner, everything is singular and unique. Nothing can then be truly compared to anything else (everything is a designer's one-off piece). By negating any form of similarity or resemblance Stirner transforms the Hegelian form of negation. As we have previously discussed, the Hegelian form of negation in both the *Phenomenology* and *Science of Logic* is to move from sensory experience, which is merely sensory and nonsensical, towards knowledge of the Ideal. Stirner returns to these initial stages of immediacy of sensory experience that is negated in Hegelian philosophy. In doing so, Stirner affirms the 'nothingness' of immediacy, the lack of an absolute Idea or telos that must be achieved for Hegel's logic. This demonstrates a reversal of a Hegelian conception of negation where the emergence of any form of association is negated in order to maintain singularity and uniqueness. Therefore, in Stirner's view singularity must always be truly unique in preventing any form of generality from emerging. This is where negation does not lead to the same universal knowledge for all individuals but maintains the uniqueness of each individual's understanding.

A Hegelian counter argument based on the necessity of universality can be made. This view could argue that singularity in itself is meaningless. The immediacy

of sensory experience does not provide knowledge since objects are only known in terms of sensual properties. In order for knowledge to emerge, singularity must be negated. However, the negation of sensual properties does not mean that each object cannot be differentiated from others. This is because negation affirms the uniqueness of an object. The uniqueness of an object is always affirmed because its singular properties are always affirmed. For instance, white is not black and black is not white. Through their inherent differences black and white are able to maintain their unique colour properties. In contrast to Stirner, a universal Idea does not prevent singularity and difference in objects but affirms them. This enables every individual to reach the same knowledge of these differences. Therefore, the conflict between Stirner's and Hegel's use of negation can be summarised as follows: It is against Stirner's use of negation that a criticism from Hegelian philosophy is made in preference of generality and as prevention of true uniqueness of singularity in order to affirm universal knowledge. In opposition to this view, Stirner affirms the singularity of individuals in order for their understanding to be truly unique. This is in order to affirm the uniqueness of each individual perspective that is generalised in being defined according to the same universal Idea.

The previous chapter's discussion of a Cartesian apprenticeship resolves the problems of Stirner's singularity and Hegel's universality. Comparable to Hegel, a rational apprenticeship argues for innateness of our ideas in order for an individual to achieve a correct understanding of the world. Without the process of rational reflection we would be unable to clearly distinguish experiential ideas from innate ideas. An example of this can be seen in Descartes' discussion in the *Meditations* of understanding the correct size of the sun:

> … I find within myself two ideas of the sun. One idea is drawn, as it were, from the senses … by means of this idea the sun appears to me to be quite small. But there is another idea, one derived from astronomical reasoning … through this idea the sun is shown to be several times larger than the earth. Both ideas surely cannot resemble the same sun existing outside me[1]

The experiential idea of the sun is that it is smaller than the earth. In contrast, the rational idea of the sun is that it is several times larger than the earth. In order to correctly understand the size of the sun or distance of the earth to the sun it must be based on a mathematical calculation. This mathematical calculation is not based on purely abstract reasoning but is subject to scientific experimentation. An experiment enables a methodology to be established in which others can affirm or deny the results.

It is because of the continual confusion of experiential and rational ideas that individuals require a Cartesian apprenticeship. This is because Cartesian apprenticeship enables an individual to remove this confusion and reflect upon the rational truth. In order to gain a correct understanding individuals must clear their mind of all false qualities of an object to reflect upon its eternal and unchanging properties. In other words, forming a correct idea is a process of reflection upon the transcendent sign. This is to remove all empirical qualities from an object in order for the true rational idea to be revealed. For Descartes, we can only trust what we can

[1] Rene Descartes, *Meditations, Objections and Replies* ed. and trans. by Roger Ariew and Donald Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2006) p.22

rationally deduce for ourselves. Another individual's knowledge cannot be trusted because their ideas are a conflation of experienced and rational ideas. It is only through completely singular apprenticeship without any external teaching or methodology that a true idea can emerge. However, in contrast to Stirner's conception of singularity, in a Cartesian apprenticeship, each individual will reflect upon the same universal idea. The same idea is reflected upon by different individuals because all differential qualities have been removed in the process of rational apprenticeship. The idea that is reflected upon then is pure and enables a universal methodology to be created where all individuals can arrive at the same understanding of the world.

It is at this point that a difference between Descartes' and Hegel's processes of rational reflection must be noted. This occurs due to their different understanding of the limits of the intellect. As Michael Inwood remarks "for Descartes the intellect is 'limited' or finite, because it cannot perceive anything and everything without end or limit. For Hegel it is infinite because it circles back on itself, especially in 'conceptual cognition, where it entirely permeates its objects, whether these be its own thoughts or external objects."[2] A Cartesian understanding of the intellect is limited due to the empirical act of association. In this way, we can only imagine or understand objects that can be associated to our own experience. We cannot then imagine objects outwith our experience such as a chiliagon, a 1000-sided polygon. In contrast, a Hegelian intellect is not limited by our experience. This is because we overcome the experiential limitation by reflection upon its absent qualities. In reflection upon absent qualities we can understand the general properties of objects which allow us to

[2] Michael J. Inwood, *A Commentary on Hegel's Philosophy of Mind* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010) p.465

distinguish one object from another. A Cartesian approach therefore attempts to understand the rational structures underlying our experience. A Hegelian approach seeks to ground our understanding on the pure mind. This allows us to overcome any limitation and move towards a purely rational and free basis for our understanding. This can be identified in Hegel's critical remarks on Descartes' innatism: "To Descartes, inborn ideas are not universal … but that which has evidence … found in thought itself … resembling what Cicero calls natural feelings implanted in the heart. We would rather say that such is implied in the nature and essence of our mind and spirit. Mind is active and … has no other ground than its freedom."[3]

A problem can be identified in all three approaches, the transcendent signifiers of the subject/Ego, Reason and pure Ideas are the foundation upon which singularity is determined. This was also the basis upon which Locke made his determination of sense as we have seen in the introduction to this thesis. The act of foundation is either through understanding how the world is a reflection of an innate idea of the mind (Descartes), how the mind captures the absolute Idea (Hegelian), or the uniqueness of their mind (Stirner). These transcendent signifiers deny that the worldly or immanent forces have any effect upon a pure metaphysical foundation for knowledge. Empirical qualities are either denied in preference to the sign (Descartes); or are completely nonsensical and therefore unable to give any knowledge or understanding without negation (Hegel); or are completely stopped from emerging by an Ego (Stirner).

[3] Georg W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on the History of Philosophy: Medieval and Modern Philosophy*, trans. by E.S Haldane and Frances H. Simson (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1995) pp.242-3

It is therefore the aim of this chapter to build upon the previous chapter's analysis of immanence in order to affirm the singularity of our understanding, arrive at meaning and be able to make sense to others. This is in order to challenge the role of a transcendent or absolute foundation for meaning. In contrast to this, I have argued that the attainment of meaning is always novel. This allows for immanent forces to continually affect our thought. At the same time, I will demonstrate that our unique understanding can be maintained, paradoxically, through the adoption of a general methodology. This will be made through an analysis of Deleuze's concept of immanent apprenticeship in *Proust and Signs*. For the moment a simple definition of this paradox can be given: upon making sense of the world we arrive at a temporary understanding, which can always be changed later as we return to an area of knowledge. In this way, the process of making sense is in a state of becoming, our understanding remaining in a fragmentary state where our knowledge is continually formed and reformed. As we make sense of things differently each time, our understanding is singular. Singularity in this sense, differs from Descartes' and Stirner's usages. For Descartes and for Stirner, singularity remains in a transcendent and abstracted state due to their vicious negation of any worldly forces. There, meaning takes precedence over sense. For Deleuze, we must take into account of the process of making sense before the attainment of meaning. By taking sense into account we can therefore affirm novelty in the process of apprenticeship. A different understanding of singularity must then be developed.

This singularity of our sense and its interaction with structure is made through an analysis of three engagements with signs in *Proust and Signs*. The first, worldly signs enable us to attain general meanings based upon its social and cultural context. This general foundation then enables us to form an understanding based upon general truth-values that are correct at a given time period. The second and third stages, signs of love and signs of art challenge this general foundation. In signs of love, we become an apprentice to another. This is because we must learn their different use of the same gestures and signs. Through this process of interpretation we are shown other possible ways and different perspectives that challenge our predisposed and presupposed views. My analysis of signs of art continues the critical analysis of the general interpretation of signs by illustrating the problem of resemblance. The act of resemblance creates generality through which all different variances share a comparable quality. Yet by comparing, we deny the unique and singular perspective of the artist's work and their understanding. With this emphasis upon uniqueness, Deleuze's brief remarks on Leibniz in *Proust* will be used in conjunction with my analysis of signs of art and of love. This is in order to demonstrate that it is the task of a Deleuzian apprenticeship to affirm this paradoxical relation between our understanding, structure and communication in order to allow for us to make continual sense of the world and thereby allow us to continually transform the way we think. Deleuze's apprenticeship is then for us to use this general structure as a foundation in order for us to attain our own understanding of its values.

Deleuze's Proust: worldly signs and generality

Deleuze's brief remark in the preface to the first edition of *Proust and Signs* defines its aim as: "the first part of this book concerns the emission and the interpretation of signs as presented in *In Search of Lost Time*. Extra material was added to the 1972 edition deals which deals with a different problem: "the production and multiplication of signs themselves, from the point of view of the composition of the search."[4] These additional chapters analyse the role of madness in Proust's works. This is not to say that Proust himself was mad, but to analyse the proliferation of signs that contests the role of a dominant signifier (X is good but A, B, C are also good options). The role of madness and Deleuze's critical approach to psychoanalysis' interpretation of signifiers can be seen in his later work of *Logic of Sense* (1969) in the twenty-sixth series on language. This later addition also draws on Deleuze's later work with Felix Guattari and their novel approach to psychoanalysis, schizoanalysis, in their work *Anti-Oedipus* (1972). Due to their contrasting analysis, only the material in the first edition will be analysed.

For Deleuze, Proust's series of novels, *In Search of Lost Time*, are a detailed study of a variety of signs. This is to analyse the way in which individual's understand and convey signs to others and why specific signs are attributed to specific signifiers: "Proust's work is based on … the apprenticeship to signs … The Search is presented as the exploration of different worlds of signs … for the signs are specific and constitute the substance of one world or another."[5] The first sign that an individual engages with is its general signification. This general meaning that has

[4] Gilles Deleuze, *Proust and Signs* trans. Richard Howard (London: Continuum, 2008) p.vii
[5] Ibid, p.4

been associated to a specific object. This general signification is defined by Deleuze as the worldly sign: “the worldly sign appears as the replacement of an action or a thought. It stands for action and for thought. It is therefore a sign that does not refer to something else, a transcendent signification or to an ideal content, but has usurped the supposed value of its meaning.”[6] For Deleuze, a worldly sign replaces meaning as its valuation is replaced by a generality. In other words, a worldly sign is blank since there is a no learning process that takes place. This is because an individual repeats the same determined actions and gestures, which in turn, expects the same response to the gesture.

For instance, this can be seen in pretending to laugh at an unfunny joke: “nothing funny is said at the Verdurins’, and Mme Verdurin does not laugh; but Cottard makes a sign that he is saying something funny, Mme Verdurin makes a sign that she is laughing, and her sign is so perfectly emitted that M. Verdurin, not to be outdone, seeks in his turn for an appropriate mimicry.”[7] There is no meaning attached to the performance as the gesture is done out of habit and conforms to the expected response. It is by habitually performing an action that a criterion is created of gestures. When these gestures are performed an individual will be able to habitually perform tasks, expect certain responses without care or consideration for the initial struggles or responses that they had received. Mme. Verdurin represents for Deleuze the performance of everyday tasks and responses through signs: “this is

[6] Ibid, p.5
[7] Ibid

why worldliness, judged from the viewpoint of actions appears to be disappointing and cruel, and from the viewpoint of thought, it appears stupid."[8]

In relation to thought, a worldly sign appears to be cruel and stupid as it prevents the emergence of a different view. In this way, a repetition of the same gesture, denies the possibility of it having a different value. This demonstrates its cruel aspect when an individual fails to recognise another valuation and only seeks to repeat what is expected of them. An individual thus remains trapped according to custom determined solely by the widely accepted way of behaving. It must be noted that a repetition of the same gesture is not a revaluation as it remains determined by habit and so never seeks to attain a higher valuation. It is through this blind obedience to a gesture that its absurdity is revealed. This can be identified in comedies which reveal the absurdity of always performing a gesture in the same way. For instance, one of Peter Seller's characters, Dr Strangelove, in Stanley Kubrick's film of the same title (1964), is an ex-Nazi scientist who cannot control the right side of his body. Due to this it can perform gestures abruptly such as infrequently performing the Nazi salute. This demonstrates the absurdity of performing the same action as Dr Strangelove's body remains completely determined by habit and so always performs the action at an inappropriate time since the film takes place during the Cold War.

A problem with a performance of a gesture being solely determined by the same criterion is its adherence to stereotypes. In each performance an individual

[8] Ibid

would signify another object or individual through their general qualities and not their own unique singular points. Through this adherence to stereotypes each performance then leads itself to racism, sexism, and bigoted views. Whilst a comedic performance of a sign reveals the absurdity of a general sign, this is would be, in contrast, to reinforce a negative image attached to a specific individual or object. For instance, this can be seen in Roland Barthes' analysis of a young black African giving a salute on the cover of a popular French newspaper *Paris Match*:

> I am at the barber's, and copy of *Paris-Match* is offered to me. On the cover, a young Negro in a French uniform is saluting, with his eyes uplifted, probably fixed on a fold of the tricolour. All this is the meaning of the picture. But whether naively or not, I see very well what it signifies to me: that France is a great Empire, that all her sons, without any colour discrimination, faithfully serve under the flag …[9]

The initial and naive signification of the image is one of patriotism. The signifier of a young black soldier giving a salute is for a shared collective feeling of patriotism to be felt by the viewer. This signification that is created has a transcendent foundation as it attempts to overcome all social and cultural differences in order for the same universal feeling of nationalism to be affirmed. However, by seeking to affirm nationalism on a transcendent grounding negates the very differences that divide the nationality of those of France and its colonies. As Barthes continues "[the image's true signification is] that there is no better answer to the detractors of an alleged

[9] Roland Barthes, *Mythologies,* trans. Anne Lavers (New York: Noonday Press, 1991) p.115

colonialism than the zeal shown by this Negro in serving his so-called oppressors ..."[10] Upon further analysis signification of patriotism is transformed to oppression. This is because far from affirming his own culture or nationality the African soldier only affirms France.

A comparable example to Barthes' soldier is the use of Nazi propaganda. This can be seen in the prior discussion of the Nazi's in the chapter on Nietzsche, this was to be affirmative of an extreme patriotism and the ideal of an Aryan Race. This ideal meant that the Nazi's patriotism had an extremely negative attitude to society, namely, to eradicate all impure German qualities from society. This transcendent ideal lead ultimately to a genocidal attitude towards the Jewish populous, as Jeffery Herf states:

> [Hitler] and his propagandists insisted that the extermination of the Jews was a justified response to a war launched against Germany … [Nazi propaganda] repeatedly asserted that an actual political subject, an actor called Jewry or international Jewry, was 'guilty' of starting and prolonging the war and that a Jewish international conspiracy was intent on exterminating Germany and the Germans.[11]

[10] Ibid
[11] Jeffery Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Ideology and Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006) pp.1-2

In both cases, the initial signification affirms an image of thought where its meaning suppresses sense. This is because a multiplicity of different understandings is negated in preference to the same universal signification of patriotism. This patriotism in the *Paris Match* example is an oppression of all cultural and social differences by maintaining the ideal of the French empire. Whilst the ideal of patriotism in Nazi propaganda also is idealistic as it led to the adoption of a genocidal attitude by seeking to eradicate 'non-German' qualities by maintaining the ideal of a supreme race. In contrast to this suppression of sense by an ideal, in Barthes' analysis, the sign is revealed to be affirmative of sense and multiplicity. In other words, Barthes' analysis of the sign penetrates the general image of thought and reveals the underlying process of thought itself. This is Barthes' task in *Mythologies* (1957) in which the essay appears, a demystification of the sign. Jonathan Culler elaborates on this project "In many cases … [Barthes] reveals the ideological implications of what seems natural, 'myth' means a delusion to be exposed."[12]

For Deleuze, comparable to Barthes' process of demystification of signs, the process of entering into an apprenticeship to worldly signs is not to accept bigoted or extremely right wing political views, rather, it is to demonstrate the fragility of such views through an apprenticeship. An apprentice is to enter into a dynamic relationship with a sign in order to revaluate knowledge: "Learning is essentially concerned with *signs*. Signs are the object of a temporal apprenticeship, not of an abstract knowledge. To learn is first of all to consider a substance, an object, a being

[12] Jonathan Culler, *Barthes: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) p.23

as if it emitted signs to be deciphered, interpreted."[13] In order for us to learn signs are necessary. This is because they give us an initial basis in which we can form an understanding of the world. We have a temporary apprenticeship with a sign in order to decipher its signification (sign X signifier Y signification Z). For instance, on perceiving a rose, there is a sign of the particular flower, signifier of a rose, and signification of love. It is through an apprenticeship and learning that we are able to overcome this initial relationship with signs in order to decipher its meaning. That is, to transvalue its general signification through gaining a personal understanding of it.

It is through this encounter, in the discovery of meaning within a sign, that an individual becomes an 'Egyptologist': "There is no apprentice who is not 'the Egyptologist' of something … everything that teaches us emits signs; every act of learning is an interpretation of signs or hieroglyphics."[14] Deleuze's use of hieroglyphics is not to privilege languages which are based on ideographs, a symbol which represents language than written word, rather, written language is itself like hieroglyphics as both attempt to represent a given idea within a conceptualisation either in word or symbol. In this way, an individual becomes like an Egyptologist by discovering meaning through a symbol. Just as in relation to love, a sign remains empty without an experience to give it meaning (she threw the flowers to the ground, shattering all my expectations).

Following this, Deleuze gives two examples of apprenticeship: "one becomes a carpenter only by becoming sensitive to the signs of wood, a physician by

[13] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.4
[14] Ibid

becoming sensitive to the signs of disease."[15] In the carpenter's case, the wood itself without any process of learning about its qualities is empty. That is an individual does not immediately know what wood would be able to be crafted and not. It is only once an individual has undergone an apprenticeship, the carpenter would be able to differentiate between different types of wood and to observe signs of decay to determine how freshly cut was a piece of wood[16]. In the physician's case, a sign of a disease without any prior knowledge is empty. An individual cannot identify which specific disease it is or the possible medical treatments available. In becoming an apprentice physician, an individual would be able to make sense of the different signs of a disease and be able to identify at what stage of development it was at. Depending on the sign of what stage of development was the disease this would lead to a diagnosis and to different treatments that were available. From this it is evident that in both apprenticeships an initial process of making sense of a sign is crucial in order for an individual to form an understanding of the world. This is because *the worldly sign provides a structure from which learning can emerge.* In other words, without affirming the general representation of an object, an apprenticeship cannot take place. Deleuze's apprenticeship to signs is therefore empirical since an individual must engage with the experiential world in order to learn from it.

[15] Ibid, p.4

[16] Gasper J. Lewis and Floyd Vogt argue that it is necessary to understand different types of wood in order to apply this knowledge practically in carpentry "the carpenter works with wood more than any other material and must understand its characteristics in order to use it intelligently ... there are many kinds of wood ... it is important to keep these qualities in mind when selecting wood." Gasper J. Lewis and Floyd Vogt, *Carpentry*, 3rd Edition (New York: Delmar, 2001) p.12

Signs of love and a multiplicity of possible interpretations

The general methodology that allows us to correctly interpret worldly signs is then put into practical use. Through this practical implementation our own style and singular perspective develops. This is to arrive at a completely unique understanding of the world. Or to put it another way, we develop one possible way to view the world. Deleuze's emphasis upon singularity and possible worlds allows us to these points to his view of Leibniz in *Proust and Signs*. This engagement with Leibniz in *Proust* is restricted to a few brief remarks.[17] The first engagement is implicitly made through a discussion of Leibniz's concept of possible worlds in the first chapter on 'Types of Signs'. This is referred to by Deleuze as plurality of signs in his initial discussion of interpreting signs of love. The plurality of signs is reflected as a possible world in the signs of the beloved in the signs of love: "The beloved appears as a sign, a 'soul'; the beloved expresses a possible world unknown to us, implying, enveloping, imprisoning a world that must be deciphered, that is, interpreted."[18]

Individuals appear to us as signs where an apprenticeship must be undertaken in order to correctly understand them. However, an interpretation of a sign of a beloved is different from a worldly sign since that they cannot be determined by any given meaning (She meant X to be nothing but X). In order to correctly understand others we must enter a relationship that challenges our preconceptions. It is through this challenge to our preconceptions that a sign reflects

[17] Deleuze's encounters with Leibniz are varied. After *Proust and Signs*, we find a discussion of the difference between Leibniz and Spinoza's concepts of expressionism in the conclusion of *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* (1968). In *Difference and Repetition* (1968), there is a discussion of Leibniz's differential calculus in the chapter four 'Ideas and the Synthesis of Difference' and his concept of difference and its relation to identity, with a contrasting analysis with Hegel's view, made in the first chapter, 'Difference in Itself'. Deleuze also gave a two series of lectures on Leibniz at Paris 8 University in Vincennes. The first course took place in 1980 and second in 1987. Transcriptions of these are available at webdeleuze.com thanks to the efforts of Richard Pinhas. After these lectures Deleuze released his main work on Leibniz, *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* (1988).

[18] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.6

a possible world, one particular aspect of how we can understand a sign. As Vincent Descombes states "It has been common practice since Leibniz to attribute to each mind its own unique vision of the world. This is just what Proust does throughout his novel. He does his best to reduce intellectual errors to optical errors that can be explained by the way things appears from such and such a perspective."[19] An example of possible worlds in Proust can be seen in Marcel's detailed explanation of kissing Albertine in *The Guermantes Way*: "At first, as my mouth began to gradually approach the cheeks which my eyes had recommended it to kiss, my eyes, in changing position saw a different pair of cheeks; the neck, observed at closer range and as through a magnifying glass, showed in its coarser grain a robustness which modified the character of the face."[20]

Marcel's initial gaze is drawn towards Albertine's cheeks, however, as his glance moves towards her neck he reflects upon qualities that had previously gone unnoticed. In this brief reflection an entire transformation of Albertine's face occurs. Marcel reflects on this transformation: "… just as Albertine had often appeared different to me, so now – as if, prodigiously accelerating the speed of changes of perspective and changes of colouring which a person presents to us in the course of our various encounters, I had sought to contain them all in the space of a few seconds …"[21] It is not just one image of Albertine, nor two, but a multiplicity that have been build up over time that Marcel wants to kiss. It through Marcel's various encounters that his image of her is continually transformed. This is represented

[19] Vincent Descombes, *Proust: Philosophy of the Novel*, trans. Catherine Chance Macksey (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992) P.40
[20] Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: The Guermantes Way* trans. by C. K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin (London: Vintage, 2000) p.420
[21] Ibid, p.421

when Marcel leans in for the kiss: "… so now, during this brief journey of my lips towards her cheek, it was ten Albertines that I saw; this one girl being like a many-headed goddess …"[22] However, this moment is short lived as the actual kiss destroys the multiple images that have been created of Albertine: "But alas – for in this matter of kissing our nostrils and eyes are as ill-placed as our lips are ill-made-suddenly my eyes ceased to see, then my nose crushed by the collision, no longer perceived any odour [from her perfume] … from these obnoxious signs, that at last I was in the act of kissing Albertine."[23]. Marcel's various images that are reflected upon are negated by closing his eyes and by pressing his nose into her flesh. That is, Marcel comes to an acceptance that there was no way in which he could kiss every image of Albertine, only one. Following Marcel's discussion of these images we can see that they are continually transformed in each attempt he seeks to make sense of the signs of Albertine. Thus Marcel always remains in a continual apprentice to the signs of love.

We can see from this example that each singular image represents a possible world. An image of Albertine defined by her cheeks, another image is created when reflecting upon her neck, and this is in turned redefined when considering her as a multiple headed goddess. These are possible worlds as they do not actually reflect Albertine but the many different senses that Marcel has of her. Each of these senses is singular and monadic. That is, truly and completely unique that cannot be compared to another. This describes Leibniz's view in *Discourse on Metaphysics* (1686) where: "each substance is like a whole world, and like a mirror of God, or

[22] Ibid
[23] Ibid

indeed of the whole universe, which each represents in its own fashion …"[24] For Leibniz, just as Marcel's many different senses of Albertine, every individual creates a multiplicity of images in the process of making sense of the world. As multiple images are created, each thing in the world has an innumerable different ways in which it could be understood.

An individual discovers new and different ways in which the world can be viewed by entering into an apprenticeship. By entering an apprenticeship, an individual must learn how to understand the world to view the world through a set of concepts. A set of concepts enables an individual to decipher the world in a particular way. In this way, as there are a variety of different disciplines and fields of study, each area of study is a world in itself. That is to say, there is not an absolute field of knowledge that would determine for all other fields a universal view of the world. This is because each subject's different set of concepts enables a multiplicity of ways in which the world can be viewed. Therefore there is no absolute way to view the world but a variety of possible representations of the world. For instance, this is reflective of philosophy where each philosopher has their own view of the world. Their view of the world is revealed through the set of philosophical concepts that are created (Descartes' cogito, Hegel's negation). In order to understand how a philosopher views the world an individual must enter into an apprenticeship in order to decipher their concepts. In this way, there is cannot be an absolute method that would allow an individual to understand the world. All what remains are singular views of a world that is created through each individual's perspective. In other words,

[24] Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Philosophical Texts*, ed. and trans. by R. S. Woolhouse and Richard Francks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) p.61

for Leibniz, every individual's perspective is completely different from another's. No two perspectives of the world are alike.

This is representative of Deleuze and Guattari's discussion of philosophical concepts as conceptual personae in *What is Philosophy*? (1991): "… conceptual personae carry out the movements that describe the author's plane of immanence, and they play a part in the very creation of the author's concepts."[25] Deleuze and Guattari challenge the attribution of a causal basis for concepts based upon an author. In order to understand their concepts we do not traditionally analyse each concept and its history but its author. By analysing its author a general framework is created in order to allow us to understand their concepts. However, for Deleuze and Guattari, a philosopher's concepts are not solely a creation of an author as they are reaction to contemporary problems. A philosophers concepts then are not created from nothing but influenced by worldly forces. In relation to Descartes, we saw how historical forces of the Scientific Revolution influenced the concept of the cogito. In order to understand a philosophical concept we should not attempt to understand a general framework since this negates a variety of different worldly influences in which each concept is created. This also negates the different periods in which a philosopher can return to their concept and change their ideas about it. Deleuze and Guattari therefore reverse the role from a traditional approach from analysing its author to a focus on analysis of various forces at work in the creation of concepts and the different periods: "… conceptual personae is not the philosopher's

[25] Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?,* trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (London: Verso, 1994) p.63

representative, but, rather, the reverse: the philosopher is only the envelope of his principal conceptual persona …"[26]

However, this is not to solely determine the role of conceptual analysis to various cultural, social or historical forces. This is because Deleuze and Guattari take into account the way in which a concept influences other individuals and transforms different preconceptions. In being able to influence others a philosophical concept remains in a state of becoming that is transformed through each interaction: "… the destiny of the philosopher is to become his conceptual persona or personae, at the same time that these personae themselves becoming something other than what they are historically, mythologically, or commonly … The conceptual personae is the becoming or the subject of a philosophy, on par with the philosopher …"[27] This means there is no absolute or causal basis in which an analysis can be made. With each analysis a different understanding of worldly forces can be made. In other words, each analysis remains singular and represents a possible way in which a concept can be understood.

Singularity and its relation to a unique understanding is developed through Leibniz's critical discussion of the construction of generalities and causal foundations. Leibniz's problem with these is illustrated through an analysis of his Principles of Indiscernibles. This is to affirm a radical nature of singularity and affirm the continual variable nature of the world. Leibniz's radical view of singularity is then

[26] Ibid, p.64
[27] Ibid

related to his later discussion of monads in the *Monadology*. This is in used in order to further highlight problems in scientific use of causality through problematizing atomic theory. I then challenge a traditional reading of Leibniz's philosophy as based upon a transcendent foundation where I argue for an immanent foundation.

Challenging resemblance and generality in Leibniz

Returning to Leibniz, we can gain further understanding the singularity of each individual's perspective through Leibniz's example of viewing a town: "the same town is differently represented according to the different situations of the person who looks at it."[28] A perspective is dependent upon each different situation. However, the situation is not determined solely upon their background. This would allow for a collection of individuals to share a comparable view (Individuals A, B, C all were brought up in X environment). Each different situation is also not based upon a subjective difference. This would also allow for two individuals to share a similarity within their views (X and Y both subjectively think Y is good). In both cases there is an attempt to negate the difference of each perspective into a shared general view. This is either in the attempt to find a causal basis or in using the subject as basis in which knowledge is constructed. By situation, Leibniz is referring to the immanent qualities of an object. The immanent qualities of an object are always in transformation such as its reflection of light. Due to this continual change in its qualities a perception is always different. Following this, when viewing a particular building in a town or city it is never the same.

[28] Leibniz, *Philosophical Texts*, p.61

As our immediate sense perception is incorrect Leibniz calls into question a purely empirical basis where our knowledge is completely derived from our senses. This is to challenge the way in which our immediate perception *generalises* our experience: “Although the senses are necessary for all our actual knowledge, they are not sufficient to provide it all, since they never give us anything but instances, that are particular or singular truths. But however many instances confirm a general truth, they do not suffice to establish its universal necessity; for it does not follow that what has happened will always happen in the same way.”[29] Based upon our associations we can sometimes assume a particular event will always happen the same way. Due to this, we assume that a particular instance holds as universally true for all other instances. For instance, from our experience we associate that daytime has sunlight and night time has an absence of light. From this expectation a universal law is constructed that day will always turn into night and night into day. Yet this is not universally true, only generally as not all places in the world experience the same passage of time. Leibniz uses the example of the island of Novaya Zemlya, a Russian Arctic Island, to illustrate this: “For instance, the Greeks and Romans and all the other nations on earth always found that within the passage of twenty-four hours day turns into night and night into day. But they would have been mistaken if they had believed that the same rule holds everywhere, since the contrary was observed during a stay in Novaya Zemlya.”[30] The length of day and night varies due to the change in the rotation of the Earth during different seasons as Jaya Balagopal explains:

[29] Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*, ed. and trans. by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) Section 49
[30] Ibid

> Varying lengths of day and night is experienced with the march of the seasons. During summer in the Northern Hemisphere, days and nights are equal on the Equator. Towards the poles, the duration of daylight increases. At the Arctic Circle there will be 24 hours of daylight … Near the poles duration of daylight will be there for 6 months … In the Southern Hemisphere winter will be experienced. The Antarctic Circle will experience 24 hours of darkness and at the South Pole there will be 6 months of darkness.[31]

Based upon empiricism, a determinate basis is attempted to be formed by general (in various instances it can be verified that X is sometimes present but not always) or universal truths (X is always true in every instance) attempt to establish certain truths However, as shown through Leibniz's example of variance of daylight and darkness, a problem with empirical perception is that there is a negation of singularities by a generality. In this case, we cannot always assume that our view of the world is universally true. This is because our understanding remains only a possible truth since the way in which we understand can be proven to be incorrect. From this we can see that truth for Leibniz is not based upon universal or general truths but is dependent upon singularities. Each individual's perspective is only possibly true. Leibniz describes an alternative view of *petites perceptions* or minute perception that takes into account these singular differences without generalising them: "We are never without perceptions, but necessarily we are often without *awareness*, namely when none of perceptions stand out."[32] Through an empirical understanding of qualities we generalise singularities or *petites perceptions*. For instance, in

[31] Jaya Balagopal, *Discover Geography*: *Book 7* (New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan, 2006) p.26
[32] Leibniz, *New Essays*, Section 162

perceiving a variety of the colour red, crimson, maroon, and blood red we may say that different colour shares the same general property of redness. However, to generalise a colour is to negate each singular variation of it. What forms our experience then is not the immediate general properties but its singular quality.

Leibniz's view of taking into account minute qualitative differences is described as the *Principle of Indiscernibility of Identicals* and has been described by modern scholars as the theory of indiscernibles or Leibniz's Law. Leibniz describes his theory of indiscernibles in his fourth paper to British philosopher and clergyman Samuel Clarke in June 1716. He writes: "there is no such thing as two individuals indiscernible from each other … To suppose two things indiscernible, is to suppose the same thing under two names."[33] That is, every individual has their own unique attributes such as their shade of eyes, hair colour, skin colour and so forth. These unique properties about individual make us able to be different from each other. Due to these singular qualities it is impossible for two individuals to be exactly the same. His theory that no two things are alike did not apply just to individuals but also the world. In discussion in the garden with a gentleman and Princess Sophie, the Elector of Hanover and future mother of George I of England in the gardens of her residence of Herrenhausen, the gentleman seeks to challenges Leibniz's theory by finding two leaves that are exactly the same, as Leibniz remarks: "An ingenious gentleman of my acquaintance, discoursing with me, in the presence of … the Princess Sophia, in the garden of Herrenhausen; thought he could find two leaves perfectly alike."[34]

[33] Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Samuel Clarke, *The Leibniz-Clarke Correspondence: Together with extracts from Newton's Principia and Optiks,* ed. by H. G. Alexander (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1956) pp. 36-7
[34] Ibid, p.36

Princess Sophia asks the gentleman, Carl August von Alvensleben who was an official at the Hanoverian Court, to prove his argument but ultimately: "… he ran all over the garden a long time to look for some; but it was to no purpose."[35]

In contrast to Leibniz, it could be argued that identical twins are replications of the same individual and so share the same qualities. Each twin sharing the same shade of eye colour, hair, and skin colour. Yet, this would be to generalise the qualities of each twin and negate their unique differences between twins. As identical twin (and writing teacher at Stanford University) Marjorie Ford explains in the foreword to her twin and psychologist Barbara Klein's *Not All Twins Are Alike* (2003): "… people tend to be so taken by the similarities in twins' appearances they may forget to think more deeply and to try and understand what it might really feel like to have a double in the world."[36] Due to this comparison that is made: "… each partner in the twinship begins to find a way to feel and to be an intensely unique individual."[37] An example of how they emphasised their differences was in tricking their teachers at school to have a case of mistaken identity: "We loved to trade our clothes in between classes so that our teachers, who could tell us apart only by memorizing our outfits, would inevitably call us the wrong name."[38] Another example was in using their own strengths to benefit a weakness of the other twin, in their different pronunciations of French and Hebrew: "Sometimes we took tests for each other … My French pronunciation was not impressive, so Barbara would sit in my seat and pass the test for me. Barbara, on the other hand, had difficulty with her Hebrew

[35] Ibid
[36] Barbara Schave Klein, *Not All Twins are Alike: Psychological Profiles of Twinship* (Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2003) p.ix
[37] Ibid, p.x
[38] Ibid, p.xi

pronunciation and would argue with our uncle, who was the rabbi of our temple, that she was pronouncing all the words correctly … [but] I knew that she was wrong."[39]

Another argument against Leibniz is through the modern development of cloning with the famous example of the clone of a sheep named Dolly in 1997. From this advent of cloning it could be argued that a clone is an exact replica or carbon copy of the original. If this is the case then it would prove that there could be two things exactly the same in nature. However, as with identical twins, no two clones are completely alike. As Kerry Lynn Macintosh explains:

> … although animals born through cloning share nuclear DNA with their donors, they are not carbon copies. Genetic factors, epigenetic factors, and environmental influences give each animal its own physical, psychological, and behavioural traits. Many don't look like their donor or siblings cloned from the same DNA … animals born through cloning are unique individuals.[40]

Singularity as monadic

Based upon an empirical understanding, we were led into error due to resemblance. When using an empirical understanding we accept general qualities (of leaves, twins, or sheep) as a true representation. However, these general qualities do not represent a true identity. A true identity is the singular qualities that enable an individual to be unique and differentiated from others. A problem then emerges for Leibniz: how are singularities able to be named independently of general terms and

[39] Ibid
[40] Kerry Lynn Macintosh, *Human Cloning: Four Fallacies and Their Legal Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) p.6

qualities? In other words, how can each singular quality be affirmed in itself without being denied through a generalization? Leibniz's answer to this problem in the *New Essays* implicitly refers to his theory of pure singularity, monads:

> … paradoxical as it may seem, it is impossible for us to know individuals or to find any way of precisely determining the individuality of anything except by keeping hold of the thing itself. For any set of circumstances could recur, with tiny differences which we would not take in; and place and time, far from being determinants by themselves, must themselves be determined by the things they contain. The most important point in this is that individuality involves infinity, and only someone who is capable of grasping the infinite could know the principle of individuation of a given thing. This arises from the influence properly understood – that all the things in the universe have on one another.[41]

In order for the singularity of a substance to be truly unique it must be completely unaffected. In being affected a substance's qualities continually transform. We are then left with a problem of being unable to correctly state what a given thing is. For instance, if looking at a painted wall, the initial colour upon decorating is vibrant but changes over time as it is affected by various forces such as wind and steam (the colour on the tin clearly stated crimson red but its slowly changed to burgundy.) In being affected then a substance has lost its unique qualities that defined it. Leibniz not only considers this level of transformation of an object based on our immediate perception but also on a molecular level. At a molecular level we can perceive how

[41] Leibniz, *New Essays*, Sections 289-90

an object is always affected and is never the same over time. In this way, there is a continual transformation of an object over a period of time (the slow decay of a wooden chair). In order to be completely unaffected a singularity must be metaphysical. This is to establish an untimely basis in which an object remains in a pure state (X is X not Y). An untimely foundation therefore secures the basis in which its singular qualities are always unaffected. Yet this metaphysical singularity is not completely separated from the material world. It is in his later work in the *Monadology* (1714) that Leibniz fully explains how a monad, or metaphysical singularity is paradoxically connected to the world.

The *Monadology* begins with the argument that there are simple substances. Monads exist because they form more complex substances: "the monad … is nothing but simple substance … meaning without parts … there must be simple substances, because there are composites … [and a] composite is nothing but a collection … of simples."[42] Leibniz here draws on Locke's idea of complex ideas in The *Essay*: "Combining several simple *Ideas* into one compound one, and thus all Complex *Ideas* are made."[43] For instance, a jigsaw is a complex picture that is formed by combining all of its parts. As we form our ideas based upon simplicity then we can associate a form of pure simplicity to an object. Leibniz thus argues that the simplest part of which forms all substances are monads.

By making this claim Leibniz is in opposition to the scientific argument for the existence of atoms as the fundamental basis of all substances. This was to react

[42] Leibniz, *Philosophical Texts*, p.268
[43] John Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. by Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975) p.163

against the revival of atomism that had recently occurred, as Daniel Garber explains "the revival of interest in ancient atomism in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. While there are a number of important figures connected with the revival of atomism, Pierre Gassendi is the most prominent. An editor, translator into Latin, and commentator on the Epicurean tracts preserved by Diogenes Laertius."[44] An argument for the existence atoms was that: "… the world was made up of a void filled with atoms, small parts of matter that are perfectly hard, unsplittable, indestructible, at least by natural means".[45] A reason Leibniz challenged an atomist view is based on a denial of singularity. That is, by stating that there is the same general atomic basis for substances then there would be no way in they could truly be singular. As Leibniz states in a note from March 1690: "A body is not a substance, but an aggregate of substances. For it consists of many things that are really distinct."[46] That is to say, a body is not a single substance. This is because a collection of singular parts (organs, different limbs, bones and fluids) form the body. It is an error of atomists and materialist philosophers to assume that unity can be found empirically: "The error of materialist philosophers lies in this, that when they acknowledged the necessity of unity they sought substance in matter, as if any body could exist that would in fact be one substance."[47] This is because all empirical bodies are a: "mass or aggregate of many bodies"[48] In other words, an individual would never be able to find a true singular substance but always a collection of qualities and substances.

[44] Daniel Garber, 'Leibniz: Physics and Philosophy' in *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*, ed. by Nicholas Jolley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) p.321
[45] Ibid
[46] Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Leibniz: The Shorter Leibniz Texts*, trans. by Lloyd Strickland (London: Continuum, 2006) p. 52
[47] Ibid, p.53
[48] Ibid

A few months later in a marginal note from 23rd October 1690 Leibniz discusses the problem of the generalisation in an atomist's view: "if there be atoms, then bodies similar and equal but different from each other could exist, so that there could be two equal spheres."[49] If all objects have the same atomic basis, there is a complete negation of the singular qualities that enable them to be different such as their size, shape, and colour. Using Leibniz's example, qualitative differences in size or colour in two spheres are negated as they are both related to the same general atomic properties. Leibniz then uses a geometric example to highlight problems in an atomist's generalisation of singularity.

Leibniz's geometric example uses a cube and two triangular prisms: "Let us assume … three atoms *A, B* and C, of which *A* is cubical but *B* and *C* are triangular prisms which compose cube *D,* which is similar and equal to the aforementioned *A.*"[50] When the two triangular prisms of B and C are placed together they form the cube of D and resemble the cube of A. From this we can clearly understand that both cubes are different. One is solid whilst the other is composed from two triangular prisms. Based upon the atomist view, despite these clear perceptual differences, both cubes have the same general basis. Yet in order to account for this atomic foundation we have to conclude, as Garber notes: "either A is made up of smaller parts, and is thus not an atom, or D is an atom, and is not made up of smaller parts, as hypothesized."[51] The solid cube of A must be made of smaller parts in order to account for the difference in D. Yet if this is the case then cube A cannot be an atom since it cannot be split. If we then accept cube D as an atom it is not made of smaller parts but composed of parts that were already evident. From this we can see the

[49] Ibid, p.144
[50] Ibid, p.120
[51] Daniel Garber, 'Leibniz: Physics and Philosophy' in *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*, p.322

geometric example confirms Leibniz's earlier note in March 1690 that it would be impossible for an atomist to find a true unity empirically since a substance is a collection of parts.

For Leibniz, the true unity of substances are monads, as he states in the *Monadology*: "… monads are the true atoms of nature …"[52] A monad is an indivisible substance that is not immediately apparent to our perception but exists upon reflection. It is through the use of rational deduction that an individual is able to reflect upon the monadic structure itself. This is because monads provide the basis for the parts various material substances in the world. If monads did not exist then there would be no structure to unify all the various material substances. Leibniz provides the reader with a mathematics example to demonstrate how rational ideas give structure to our physical world: "Substances do not exist when a substance does not exist, and numbers do not exist unless there are unities, and so it is necessary that besides bodies there exist certain substances truly one, or indivisible, by whose aggregations bodies are formed."[53] In relation to mathematics, by adding or removing objects various equations can be performed such as addition, subtraction, multiplication and so forth. Yet the objects by themselves do not provide any structure. This is because it is the mathematical structure that supplies a framework in which we can understand the various arrangements of objects. A mathematical structure provides such a framework that we do not require any material objects in order for equations to be true.

[52] Leibniz, *Philosophical Texts*, p.268
[53] Leibniz, *The Shorter Leibniz Texts*, p.53

In contrast to a material substance that is perishable over time and which also loses its singularity through transformation, a monad is metaphysical. By having a metaphysical basis every substance is able to maintain its singularity (Each leaf is unique). An individual cannot create a monad as this would require the destruction and loss of these unique properties. For instance, a painting of a leaf cannot capture the exact same use of colours. To replicate it would then mean an imperfect copy of the original. From this, Leibniz is able to maintain that even when we create substances in the world, its singular qualities can never be truly eradicated. An untimely foundation also means that a substance cannot be transformed into another over time. This explains why, like Descartes' cogito, a monad subsists throughout time despite a continual flux in experiential properties: "A substance, however, is something truly one, indivisible, and thus ingenerable and incorruptible … which subsists even though my body undergoes changes through its parts, as my body is certainly in a perpetual flux, while 'I' survive. No part of my body can be identified which is necessary for my subsistence, yet I am never without some united part of matter."[54]

By having a metaphysical basis, it can be assumed that there is a loss of a material objects qualities. This is the case in Descartes' metaphysics where upon reflection on the cogito there is the loss of all material qualities of the body. Yet for Leibniz, despite their metaphysical basis, monads are able to maintain their uniqueness: "… monads must have some qualities otherwise they would not even be beings. Moreover, if simple substances did not differ in their qualities, there would be

[54] Ibid

no way of detecting any change in things."[55] Monads are able to be distinguished because they are not completely detached from the world but are part of it. We can identify that monads are part of the world because, as attained through the law of Indiscernibles, everything is singular. Without the existence of monads, everything would be exactly the same. There would be a complete loss of all unique properties and so nothing would be able to distinguish from one another. This enables a further explanation of Leibniz's theory of Indiscernibles for why each thing in the world is truly different: "… every monad must be different from every other. Because in nature there are never two being that are perfectly alike …"[56]

Based upon this immanent view of Leibniz's philosophy, Deleuze's discussion of signs of art in *Proust* demonstrates a way in which singularity can be actualized. In other words, our unique understanding is always actualized through the general methods that is used (This conforms to the earlier discussion in the introduction of how our unique sense is maintained through the use of general names.) This is illustrated through a discussion of Cezanne. This view is then problematized through a reading of Proust where Vinteuil longs for a musical phrase to return. In this way, Proust illustrates a Platonic problem with the use of ideal or category challenges the actual novel differences. This enables the Platonic problem to be further developed in the next chapter on Plato's *Cratylus.*

[55] Leibniz, *Philosophical Texts*, p.268
[56] Ibid, p.269

Signs of Art: signs as reflective of monadic singularity

Deleuze's relates Leibniz's concept of monads to aesthetic signs. This occurs in the fourth chapter of *Proust and Signs*, 'Essences and the Signs of Art':

> What is an essence as revealed in the work of art? It is a difference, the absolute and ultimate difference …what is an absolute, ultimate difference? Not an empirical difference between two objects, always extrinsic … In this regard Proust is Leibnizian: the essences [of things] are veritable monads, each defined by the viewpoint to which it expresses the world, each viewpoint itself referring to an ultimate quality at the heart of the monad."[57]

Aesthetics signs are monadic because they enable us to reflect on singularity within the world. In contrast, material objects without artistic expression is based on resemblance. This negates each singularity quality of an object into sharing the same general properties. Artistic expression of objects enables an individual to reflect upon singularity of material objects. For instance, in Paul Cézanne's *Still Life with Apples and Oranges (*c.1895-1902) there is a challenge to our idea of apples and oranges, as Carol Armstrong explains:

> … apple is all but indistinguishable from orange, though it is safe to say, because of coloration, that the oranges sit in the compotier and apples in the plate, and a mix of the two is found loose around them and the pitcher … [this enables us to question] the ability to attach the names of objects to their

[57] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.27-8

> painted representations – how can we be sure they are apples? – and the capacity to identify and distinguish the aspects of simple things with continuous spherical surfaces – what is the difference between the front and back of an apple … and where does one draw the dividing line between them?[58]

Cézanne's use of coloration enables us to call into question our knowledge of objects based on resemblance. From our resemblance, we associate the various colours of green, red and yellow into a generality of our idea of an apple. However, these colours are not solely unique to apples, yellow is also apparent in the oranges in the compotier. Ruby oranges, once sliced open, have red innards and oranges grown in a tropical climate are green. Following this, the same colours of red, yellow, and green can be also applied to oranges. Based on our general understanding leads us incapable of clearly distinguishing between objects. What enables us to distinguish between objects is their singular qualities. These singular qualities are expressed through Cézanne's precise use of coloration. Each apple has a singular way in which the colours of green, red and yellow are expressed. This can be seen in the different levels of intensity that is expressed in each use of colour. A hint of yellow is expressed at the top of one apple whilst another has a more prominent use of yellow at its top. In the oranges, there is a different use of colouration based upon the intensity of orange that is used. Whilst others which express yellow hint upon its variation with orange, blending the two together but maintaining their separation.

[58] Carol Armstrong, *Cézanne in the Studio: Still Life in Watercolors* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2004) p.52

Art enables us to reflect upon an immaterial sign within a material object that reveals an idea: "…art gives us the true unity: unity of the immaterial sign and of an entirely spiritual meaning. The essence is precisely this unity of sign and meaning as it is revealed in the work of art."[59] Deleuze illustrate this by using music: "Essences or Ideas, that is what each sign of the little phrase reveals. This is what gives the phrase its real existence independent of the instruments or incarnate it more than they compose it."[60] It is the purpose of playing a sequence of notes by a musician that a composer wants to inspire a certain idea within individuals. Here Deleuze remarks on the way in which Marcel reflects upon Vinteuil's phrase that is played simultaneously by piano and violin: "Vinteuil's little phrase is uttered by the piano and the violin. Of course, it can be decomposed materially, five notes very close together two of which recur. But in their case, as in Plato 3 + 2 explains nothing … the notes merely the 'sonorous appearance of an entirely spiritual entity."[61]

This spiritual image that is revealed to Marcel by the piano is that of the sea: "… he had suddenly become aware of the mass of the piano-part beginning to emerge in a sort of liquid rippling of sound, multiform but indivisible, smooth yet restless, like the deep blue tumult of the sea, silvered and charmed into a minor key by the moonlight."[62] When the music had finished playing, Marcel gains a heightened sense of the world: "… suddenly enraptured, he had tried to grasp the phrase or harmony … that had just been played and that had opened and expanded his soul, as the fragrance of certain roses, wafted upon the moist air of evening, has the

[59] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.27
[60] Ibid
[61] Ibid, p.26
[62] Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Swann's Way* trans. by C. K. Scott Moncrieff, trans. revision by. D. J. Enright (London, Vintage, 2005) p.250

power of dilating one's nostril's."[63] This moment of heightened sensation, like his encounter with multiple Albertines, is short lived: "With a slow and rhythmical movement it led him first this way, then that, towards a state of happiness that was noble, unintelligible, and yet precise. And then … having reached a certain point … it changed direction and in a fresh movement, more rapid, fragile, melancholy, incessant, sweet, it bore him off with it towards new vistas. Then it vanished."[64] After the second time hearing the phrase: "He hoped, with a passionate longing, that he might find it again, a third time. And reappear it did though without speaking to him more clearly, bringing him, indeed, a pleasure less profound."[65]

From this, Marcel's experience can be defined according to a lack. This lack is due to being unable to recapture the same heightened experience through the repetition of the musical phrase. As Miguel de Beistegui explains "… Proust's point is to show that the dissatisfaction - whether in the form of suffering or in the form of boredom – that defines our relation to the world actually stems from an even deeper lack, one inscribed at the heart of reality itself."[66] The lack is not resolved through the process of repetition itself where "[it] could be remedied by a strategy of compensation, by recapturing or reproducing the 'thing' that's lacking."[67] This is because it is part of the very structure of our experience: "It's precisely by lacking that what's lacking 'functions' and 'structures'. And it's precisely this lack or this deficiency that we experience … I'd go so far as to say that it actually defines the

[63] Ibid
[64] Ibid, p.251
[65] Ibid, p.251-2
[66] Miguel de Beistegui, *Proust as Philosopher: The Art of Metaphor* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013) p.2
[67] Ibid

very meaning of experience, that is, the meaning of the sensible."[68] Marcel's lack therefore is based upon an expectation of a return of same phrase. In anticipating the same phrase to return, there is a determination of his experience by an ideality. Each subsequent repetition of the phrase then leads to a lack where each phrase does not meet his previous experience.

This lack can also be applied to the structures of our experience as they cannot adequately express the embodiment of the world itself. Deleuze relates this creation of a lack by ideality in Proust to Plato: "… Proust treats essences as Platonic Ideas and confers upon them an independent reality. Even Vinteuil has 'revealed' the phrase more than he has created it."[69] Based upon a Platonic view, an artist bases his expression upon a differential measurement. This is to measure the various differences qualities of things in the material world: "… the art of measurement is universal, and has to do with all things."[70] A bad artist distorts our idea so we are unable to clearly distinguish between objects: "… because they are not accustomed to distinguish classes according to real forms, jumble together two widely different things … and to a standard under the idea that they are the same …"[71] For instance, Plato would have a negative view of Cézanne's *Still Life with Apples and Oranges* because it does not conform to our resemblance of apples and oranges. We are unable to clearly distinguish or identify the fruits and so Cézanne's painting jumbles together two very different things. In order for us to understand the

[68] Ibid
[69] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.28
[70] Plato, The Statesman 285b in Albert Hofstadter and Richard Kuhns (eds.) *Philosophies of Art and Beauty: Selected Reading in Aesthetics from Plato to Heidegger* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964) p.7
[71] Ibid

ideas that are expressed, an artist must express the general quality that is reflected in the variety of different qualities[72]. As Plato states:

> … the right way is, if a man has first seen the unity of things, to go on with the enquiry and not desist until he has found all the differences contained in it which form distinct classes; nor again should he be able to rest contented with the manifold diversities … until he has comprehended all of them that have any affinity within the bounds of one similarity and embraced them within the reality of a single kind.[73]

Conclusion

An apprenticeship is based upon the performance of signs. Each performance is based upon a gesture that is associated with a sign. (Mme. Verdurin's performance of laughing at an unfunny joke) The performance of gestures implies a correct and incorrect action based upon social convention. It is from this initial basis that worldly signs are positive since they allow us to understand the structure of our society and culture. It also enables us to learn from methodologies. This leads to an educational system to be created where we must repeat the method's correct answer in order to have a sound judgment. However, if we are solely reliant upon the performance of signs, there is also a denial of the process of learning. This is because education is always predetermined according to the same set of criteria. The process of learning implies that these general social conventions must be challenged. They must be challenged in order for an individual to know, but to know what? Precisely, it is not

[72] Plato's theory of art is also related to his theory of ethics, as Tom Rockmore explains "Plato's widely known rejection of imitative art is motivated and justified by his commitment to a political approach to art in the city-state. This is the art of constructing a just or good state, based on the intuitive grasp of reality beyond mere appearance. The true artist is not just anyone … [but] someone qualified to do just this [reflect upon the Ideas], hence to direct the city." Tom Rockmore, *Art and Truth after Plato* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013) p.3

[73] Plato, The Statesman 285b in Albert Hofstadter and Richard Kuhns (eds.) p.7

methodology or society that solely determines knowledge but also how an individual makes sense. It is through this process of making sense of the world that an individual must enter into an apprenticeship to signs. This is no longer to simply perform and repeat the same signs but to rediscover signs. In other words, an individual no longer performs what is expected but begins to make individual sense of the processes around why it is performed in a certain way.

This is why Deleuze relates an apprenticeship to signs of love and signs of art. With signs of love there is a rediscovery of our love. To rediscover love is to affirm the multiplicity of things we love about a specific thing (Marcel's multiple images of Albertine). This transforms our image of things from being based upon ideality (an image of thought) to a number of different possible reasons for why we love them. Through opening up a number of possible reasons our image of thought is challenged. In this way, thought is not determined by transcendent signifiers (the Ego, Reason) but rather, is continual affected through immanent processes. This multiplicity of forces is displayed through signs of art. It is signs of art that demonstrate the singularity of our thought (the singularity of Cezanne's apples and oranges). Our thought is monadic as it is truly unique and cannot be compared to another's. A monadic foundation for thought challenges the rationalist apprenticeship since there can never be a point of a shared view between individuals. As can be seen in artistic representation, every image will be different since it reflects not only the unique perspective of the artist but also the temporal capture of an image of the world that is continually in flux. Each image is a still frame in time that represents a particular way in which we viewed the world. Yet this still frame can always be

returned to, transforming how we initially thought of it (the heavily criticised film that turns into a cult classic).

From my analysis of the Platonic influence in Proust, a problem arises for Deleuze's theory of monadic singularity. This problem is that singularity and ideality are opposed. Or to put it another way, the process of making sense and attaining meaning are opposed. This problem is reflected in the two ways in which art is expressed for Deleuze. On the one hand, art expresses an idea (Marcel's reflection on Vinteuil's phrase as an image of the sea). The created ideality negates all other forms (each subsequent repetition of the phrase is negated). On the other hand, Deleuze also remarks that essence also expresses immanence: "each subject expresses the world from a certain viewpoint. But the viewpoint is the difference itself, the absolute internal difference. Each subject therefore expresses an absolutely different world."[74] In this way, there is no clear way for singularity to be immanent. It is metaphysical and detached from the world and so must be based upon a transcendent metaphysics. Deleuze raises this problem of singularity in Leibniz through the inability of monads to communicate: "Philosophically, Leibniz was the first to raise the problem of a communication resulting from sealed parts or from what does not communicate. How are we to conceive the communication of 'monads' that have neither door nor window?"[75]

An epistemic problem of monadic communication is that individuals have a singular understanding, whilst at the same time, they must communicate through the use of a general language that has been established by society. How then is an

[74] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.28
[75] Ibid, p.105

individual able to maintain unique understanding through a general language? If we attempt to resolve this problem by justifying the use of proper names (a private use of language) in order to maintain our unique perspective, this does not allow for any other individual to understand us. The problem of monadic communication can be related to an empirical problem with the inherence of monads that is raised by Johnathan Bennett: "… how can extended things 'result' from monads? Not, one would think, in the ordinary causal way in which a forest-fire results from lightning."[76] This calls into question how monads, as metaphysical substances, can inhere in a physical substance. This follows from Leibniz's insistence that monads must remain completely unaffected in order to retain their singularity. In being completely unaffected, a monad has no extension, this is, a way in which it can affect a physical substance. However, to say that something remains unaffected seems bizarre. This is because from an empirical perspective, we can perceive how material substances can have effects on one another. This is because we can perceive how change occurs. For instance, we can perceive that there is a flash of lightning and then a forest fire resulting from it. Following this empirical view, we cannot perceive or detect by any empirical means a monad. We only can detect singularities in physical objects that are derived from its monadic structure. From this Bennett argues "… extended things cannot contain monads as *parts*, properly so-called."[77] Parts are things which are evident to our senses. Without being evident we can never be truly certain of a metaphysical basis for a substance. This dualism is reflected in communication between our monadic understanding and general language. An

[76] Johnathan Bennett, *Kant's Dialectics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974) p.45
[77] Ibid

opposition is therefore created between the metaphysical (based upon pure singularity) and physical world[78] (based upon generality).

A Leibnizian reply to this empirical criticism of monadic dualism is based upon the concept of a pre-established harmony, as Deleuze states: "Leibniz's [solution is] … that the closed 'monads' all possess the same stock, enveloping and expressing the same world in the infinite series of their predicates, each content to have a region of expression distinct from that of the others, all thus being different viewpoints toward the same world that God causes them to develop."[79] All monads are able to communicate their own singular perspective of the world because, for Leibniz, God is both the creator of the world and monads: "… God is the source not only of existences, but also of essences, in so far as they are real; he is the source of what reality there is among possibilities. This is because God's understanding is the realm of eternal truths … and without God … not only would nothing exist, but nothing would be possible."[80] In being creator of both, God establishes a harmony between each metaphysical singularity and material world[81].

[78] Bertrand Russell in the *History of Western Philosophy* also alludes to the problem of monadic dualism: "Leibniz held that extension cannot be an attribute of a substance. His reason was that extension involves plurality, and can therefore only belong to an aggregate of substances; each single substance must be unextended. He believed, consequently, in an infinite number of substances, which he called 'monads'." Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2004) p.533

[79] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.105

[80] Leibniz, *Philosophical Texts,* p.273

[81] God as a foundation for the relation between monads and the world is also the reason why this world is the best possible world that could have been created, as Donald Rutherford explains "Accepting that no possible world contains more monads, or at least more monads with as rich variety of distinct perceptions, we may conclude that in creating the greatest collection of monads, God thereby realizes the greatest possible harmony among their perceptions. Yet Leibniz sees God as going beyond this. The more levels at which there can be conceived an order or agreement among a variety of things, the more harmony God produces. Consequently, Leibniz envisions God as embedding harmonies within harmonies, so as to realize a world as harmonious as any world could be." Donald Rutherford, *Leibniz and the Rational Order of Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) p.227

It is through his reading of Proust that Deleuze criticises the transcendent nature of monads: "This can no longer be the case for Proust, for whom so many various worlds correspond to viewpoints toward the world … and not constitute a preestablished stock."[82] In opposition to Leibniz, in Proust, there is no pre-established harmony because each monad is part of an *immanent* relation to the world. This is because singularity and difference always underlies the construction of Marcel's ideality. This can be identified in Vinteuil's repeated phrase, as Deleuze states: "… Vinteuil's phrase, is itself valid as a part alongside others, adjacent to others: unity 'appears (but relating now to the whole) like any one fragment composed separately,' like a last localized brushstroke, not like a general varnishing."[83] That is, by idealising his experience of a specific repetition Vinteuil's phrase, Marcel fails to appreciate the uniqueness of each phrase. If Marcel was open to the novelty and differences in each repeated phrase then we would have enjoyed his experience, rather than failing to capture his initial experience.

Deleuze's later work on Leibniz in *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* (1988) attempts to rethink this criticism of the transcendent nature of monads to focus on an immanent monadic structure[84]. An aspect of this can be seen by Deleuze's

[82] Deleuze, *Proust and Signs*, p.106
[83] Ibid
[84] Deleuze's process of rethinking of Leibniz's philosophy from transcendent to immanent foundation can be related to a difference between Descartes and Leibniz in their use of rational deduction. In Descartes' second meditation we are able to use rational deduction in order to reflect upon the wax. In doing so, we move away from an empirical understanding where its qualities are constantly in flux to a rational understanding of its universal unchanging properties. However, Descartes used rational deduction as proof of the sign of innate ideas of the mind. The mind providing an absolute structure to the world. In contrast, Leibniz used reasoned deduction to prove a structure exists *within* material substances. That is, Leibniz does not seek to establish an abstract metaphysical basis that structures knowledge of the world itself. This is because metaphysical basis is apparent from *within* the material object itself. In philosophical terms, as monads exist within objects, his philosophical foundation is immanent. Descartes' foundation is transcendent since it is a metaphysics that is based upon truths that are abstract from the world. Therefore *Leibniz has reversed the role of metaphysics that is transcendent and based upon sameness [the purity of the cogito] to one that is based upon immanence and difference*. This monadic metaphysics is based upon understanding of singularity in the world. Without this immanent basis to

association of the emergence of Leibniz's concept of monads as a response to the Baroque period. Monads, in this sense, are no longer purely metaphysical but are a response to a contemporary need to define modernity, as an expression of various aspects of history where each part is maintained in a fold: "the Baroque refers not to an essence but rather to an operative function, to a trait. It endlessly produces folds. It does not invent things: there are all sorts of folds coming from the East, Greek, Roman … Yet the Baroque trait twists and turns its folds … fold over fold, one upon the other."[85] This leads Deleuze to establish a different monadic harmony in the final chapter of *The Fold* where the paradox of singularity is maintained and not resolved through a pre-established harmony.

The next chapter continues the discussion of the paradox of an immanent position through a discussion of Plato's *Cratylus*. This paradox that is evident in the conflict between the two opposing views of Hermogenes and Cratylus. Put simply, Hermogenes affirms an empirical plurality of multiple senses. In contrast, Cratylus argues for the use of etymology in order to establish an absolute meaning. The aim of the next chapter will then be to develop Plato's solution to the empirical and rationalist tension. This is to create a metaphysical foundation for meaning by demonstrating how the many and the one function together. In philosophical terms, each particular empirical object is a reflection of the same Idea.

---

uphold singularity itself in each object everything is left to an understanding based upon a transcendent metaphysics.

[85] Gilles Deleuze, *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, trans. Tom Conley (London: Continuum, 2006) p.3

5

Logic of Sense and Plato: Towards a pure metaphysical foundation for meaning

Introduction

I have so far identified that Deleuze challenges the traditional epistemological model, or image of thought. His concern with this philosophical model is how it has an implicit effect upon our judgment: "By [image of thought] I mean not only that we think according to a given method, but also that there is a more or less implicit, tacit or presupposed image of thought which determines our goals when we try to think."[1] We must then always repeat the same techniques involving rational deduction in order to be correct and attain clarity of our thoughts. For instance, this can be identified in the Cartesian apprenticeship where an individual uses rational deduction to remove any doubt by reflecting upon the transcendent sign (such as the cogito). Or in Hegelian apprenticeship, an individual must use rational deduction to reflect upon the ideal properties of an object. When an individual then attempts to *think differently* from these models they are portrayed as incorrect and idiotic. This is because we differentiate ourselves from the norm and what is socially accepted as an answer: "we suppose that thought possesses a good nature, and the thinker a good will, we take as a model the process of recognition – in other words, a common sense … on a supposed same object: we designate error, nothing but error, as the

[1] Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton (London: Continuum, 2004) p.xv

enemy to be fought; and we suppose that the true concerns solutions – in other words, propositions capable of serving as answers."[2]

As we have seen it is this engagement with the image of thought that defines Deleuze's early philosophy. Deleuze's alternative model, to affirm the act of thinking differently defines his move from the early work to *Difference and Repetition* (1968)*:* "A new image of thought – or rather, a liberation of thought from those images which imprison it: this is what I had already sought to discover in Proust … however, in *Difference and Repetition* this search is autonomous and it becomes the condition for the discovery of these two concepts."[3] In the previous chapter, this alternative and new image of thought in *Proust and Signs* was defined according to a Leibnizian apprenticeship. This process of apprenticeship involved three stages: worldly signs, signs of love and signs of art. Worldly signs define our initial experiential engagement where a social and cultural background provides a basis for our interpretation. Although criticising the traditional epistemic model in philosophy this demonstrates its importance for Deleuze since it provides a foundation for thought. Deleuze then does not seek to destroy all prior epistemic models in order for his own model to be accepted as the best. Or to allow for a foundation where a brand new model must be continually created.

Signs of love enable us to discover other possible perspectives or ways of thinking. This is identified in Proust where Marcel has a preconceived idea of Albertine. This idea is challenged when reflecting upon other images of her. When leaning in for the kiss he must then decide to choose one specific idea of her. In

[2] Ibid
[3] Ibid

philosophical terms, this is related to Leibniz's concept of possible worlds. This is because each individual has a different perspective in which we view the world. Different perspectives then challenge a general or absolute view by affirming the multiplicity of variations of styles and techniques within a method. For instance, in playing guitar, there is a multiplicity of different artists that transform how we think of it (did you hear X? I didn't even realise that was possible within Y). As Thomas Harrison notes we identify this in Eddie Van Halen's finger tapping technique: "Van Halen's success started with an eponymous album in 1978, featuring … a guitar solo that featured Eddie Van Halen, 'Eruption'. The inclusion of the solo helped Van Halen become the leader of the 1980s guitar style ... largely because the solo included new guitar techniques not seen in the commercial realm, especially two-handed slurs (also known as tapping)."[4]

The Leibnizian apprenticeship is developed in the last stage, signs of art. This is because for Deleuze each individual's perspective is completely unique. In philosophical terms, our understanding is a monadic singularity. We are then faced with the problem of dualism, a separation of subject and world. This is comparable to Stirner's unique ego defined in chapter 2. Deleuze identified that in Stirner we arrive at a metaphysics of pure difference with no way for us to actualise our understanding. Any attempt to do so would negate our uniqueness. Deleuze resolves the problem of dualism through the relation of immanence to monadic singularity. With this relation to immanence, any concept or philosophical idea is constructed and influenced by worldly forces.

[4] Thomas Harrison, *American History through Music: Music of the 1980s* (California: Abc-Clio, 2011) p.37

Deleuze's Alphabet interview with Claire Parnet, highlights this relation of immanence to the creation of Plato's concept of the Idea. A traditional understanding of Plato's concept of the Idea is that it is transcendent, abstract and metaphysical. As Stephen Mumford explains "Plato thought that the perfect [understanding of things] existed in a heavenly, transcendent world: above and beyond the physical world of everyday objects that we inhabit. This heavenly realm would contain all the true versions of all the properties and relations too."[5] Plato's Idea is not based on our experience of the world, as this is merely an imperfect copy. The Idea then becomes Plato's metaphysical foundation for knowledge as it allows for truth and certainty in shared universal understanding between individuals: "[Plato] found himself in a given situation: that whatever happens … or whatever might be a given therein, there are rivals. That is, there are people who say: for this thing, I'm the best example of it … the problem for Plato … [is] how to select [between] the claimants, how to discover among them which one is the valid one … It's the Idea, that is, the thing in a pure state, that will permit this selection."[6]

In contrast to this, Deleuze argues Plato's Idea only appears to be abstract since we have not considered the problem that Plato was responding to, namely, those of a democratic Athenian society: "[The problem of selection between claimants] begins with the Greeks because it's a typically Greek problem of the democratic, Greek city … The Athenian city is this rivalry of claimants …it's a civilisation in which confrontation with rivals constantly appears: that's why they invented gymnastics, they invent [the] Olympic games … they invent legal

[5] Stephen Mumford, *Metaphysics: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) p.17
[6] Deleuze, 'H as in the History of Philosophy', *From A to Z*, trans. by Charles J. Stivale, dir. by Pierre-Andre Boutang (London: Semiotext(e), 2011)

procedures …"[7] Plato's understanding of imperfect copies reflect the many different ways in which rivalry is responded to in Ancient Greek society such as in the Olympic games and legal proceedings. This removes the abstract understanding of the concept to reveal the social and cultural influences which form a worldly foundation to Plato's concept of the Idea. In other words, with a consideration of the problems in which the concept of the Idea emerged, no longer makes it a metaphysical concept but becomes concrete: "If you haven't found the problem to which a concept corresponds, everything stays abstract. If you've found the problem, everything becomes concrete."[8]

From this it can be said, if everything becomes concrete through the consideration of a problem, for Deleuze, then why is the problem not always apparent? His answer is that a philosopher wants to give meaning to these social and cultural problems: "one might wonder why the problem isn't clearly stated by a philosopher since it certainly exists in [their] work ... the philosopher's task is already that of exposing the concepts that he/she is in the process of creating, so he/she can't expose the problems on top of that or at least one can discover these problems only through the concepts being created."[9] For Deleuze, meaning is so vigorously sought by a philosopher that the preceding social and cultural processes that are being reacted to form part of their understanding. Their answer to these problems is through a concept. In other words, *in seeking to understand the world a philosopher is formed by but oblivious to the process of sense that underlies it*. It is then the task of a reader and not a philosopher to engage with their work in order to correctly

[7] Ibid
[8] Ibid
[9] Ibid

situate their concepts according to the social and cultural influences which shape their understanding of the world. This allows a reader to reconstruct the various social and cultural influences that affected a philosopher's thought that they had otherwise had been oblivious to.

This chapter firstly analyses Deleuze's remarks on Plato's Cratylus in *Logic of Sense*. This is because these remarks further develop Deleuze's Leibnizian apprenticeship and emphasis upon perspective and singularity. This is identified through the two contrasting characters of Hermogenes and Cratylus. Hermogenes' view affirms singularity and a private use of language. In contrast, Cratylus argues for a rationalist view by where the etymological origin is the meaning of a word. An analysis of Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views then allows me to demonstrate how the Platonic foundation for language overcomes this tension. This is where Plato overcomes the empirical (pure becoming) and rational tension (causal origin) towards a pure metaphysics of the Idea that resolves problems in both positions. My view of Plato presented is contrary to a traditional view of his philosophy of language. The traditional view is where words are negated altogether in preference to the Idea. I argue that language and Ideas form a paradoxical relationship. Words remain an expression of the Idea, although imperfect, still retaining an essence of perfection. The next chapter returns to this tension in my reading of Deleuze's *Logic of Sense* where it is argued that this paradox is affirmed, rather than, overcome.

Sense as a process and knowledge as becoming

In *Logic of Sense* Deleuze identifies a tension in the concept of sense: "good sense affirms that in all things there is a determinable sense or direction: but paradox is the affirmation of both senses or directions at the same time."[10] This tension is between good sense and sense as a process of understanding. A methodology enables us to have good sense by following its guidelines. This allows us to have a specific understanding of what something means. In this way, our understanding is predetermined to repeat the same meaning or action (C does not follow Y try again! Correct, C follows B). What Deleuze makes us aware of is that sense is a process. That is, when understanding we learn about other possible perspectives or techniques. It is due to this that sense itself cannot be truly determined by a given methodology. This is because each time we attempt to learn our sense is continually transformed. For instance, when we are attempting to understand something and state 'this does not make sense'. This struggle forces us to challenge our presuppositions. When suddenly what seemed to make perfect sense no longer holds as true (I thought I knew X but Y has made me rethink X altogether). The revelation presented to our thought is that our understanding is not predetermined by repetition of the same meaning or in adherence to a universal foundation. This is because through the process of understanding *we repeat differently.* In philosophical terms, our understanding and knowledge is in a continual state of becoming.

Deleuze's account of difference as becoming is developed in his prior work *Difference and Repetition*. It is there that Deleuze challenges our traditional understanding of repetition based upon habit. Due to this, we assume repetition is to

[10] Gilles Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, ed. by Constantin V. Boundas, trans. by Mark Lester and Charles Stivale (London: Continuum, 2004) p.1

repeat the same action or process (His daily habit involved buying a set of sandwiches, a packet of crisps and a sweetie for lunch). However, Deleuze challenges this understanding: "Repetition is not a generality."[11] Henry Somers-Hall develops this in relation Deleuze's discussion of law in the natural sciences: "We normally see laws as applying to all particular entities that resemble one another in a pertinent way, that is, all particulars that fall under a generality."[12] For instance, a general property of apples is that their colours are green, red or yellow. In relation to experimentation a causal principle determines and governs all particulars instances: "the laws of gravitation apply to particular bodies in so far as they have mass."[13] Deleuze's claim is that: "… we do not really encounter repetition."[14] That is, we do not encounter the continually changing qualities and variations that occur in each experiment. In this way, we do not take into account the novel differences that occur. As Somers-Hall notes this can be seen through generalisation of experiential data by its quantification: "These [experiential] factors …are understood in terms that are essentially quantitative … in order to conduct an experiment, we presuppose that the pertinent features of a system can be understood in numerical terms."[15]

Deleuze's concept of difference is then Leibnizian. Everything in the world is a completely singular and unique. It is due to this that Deleuze reverses the Platonic model that moves from particular to general, as Daniel W. Smith remarks "Plato defines [difference] in purely negative terms; it is the copy of a copy, an endlessly degraded copy, an infinitely slackened icon."[16] For Plato, the Idea takes precedence

[11] Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, p.1
[12] Henry Somers-Hall, *Deleuze's Difference and Repetition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013) p.7
[13] Ibid
[14] Ibid
[15] Ibid, p.8
[16] Daniel W. Smith, *Essays on Deleuze* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012) p.12

over any particulars. In this way, every object that we experience is a 'degraded copy' of a metaphysical ideal. To reverse this model "… means that the difference between copy and simulacrum must be seen, not merely as a difference of degree but as a *difference in nature* … The simulacrum must then be given its own concept and be defined in affirmative terms."[17] Like Stirner's extreme egoism, we must not attempt to compare or contrast uniqueness. In order for uniqueness to be affirmed we must allow for a revaluation of an idea. In doing so, an idea becomes dynamic and allows for other perspectives, rather than, privileging the view of one over many.

Underlying this metaphysics is Deleuze's epistemic concern, namely, that we must negate the multiplicity of senses in order to arrive at meaning. In other words, this is in order to move from the process of learning to the attainment of understanding. Deleuze identifies a relation to Plato where we seek to both clearly define an idea and attain meaning for ourselves:

> Plato ... distinguishes between two dimensions (1) that of limited and measured things, of fixed qualities, permanent or temporary which always presuppose pauses and rests, the fixing of presets, and the assignation of subjects ... and (2) a pure becoming without measure, a veritable becoming-mad, which never rests. It moves in both directions at once. It always eludes the present, causing future and past, more or less, too much and not enough to coincide in the simultaneity of a rebellious matter.[18]

[17] Ibid
[18] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, pp.1-2

The two dimensions represent the rationalist and empirical divide. The rationalist position seeks fixity where transcendent concepts are created in order for knowledge to always remain the same. This is to allow for every individual, regardless of his or her social or cultural backgrounds or time period to arrive at the same correct understanding. On the other hand, the empirical position affirms the transitory nature of knowledge. This is where knowledge remains a state of continual change. An empirical view then allows for other perspectives to challenge and overturn dominant views and thereby change how we think of the world.

This divide also represents the influence of the pre-Socratics Parmenides and Heraclitus on Plato. Parmenides takes a 'rationalist' and monist position and identifies problems with an empirical view of becoming: "… how could what becomes have being … seeing that, if it came to be, it is not, nor is it, if at some time it is going to be. Thus becoming has been extinguished and perishing is unheard of."[19] That is, if a thing continually changes we cannot be certain that it exists. This is because at the moment it exists, it is *not the same object* [X is now Y]. We cannot perceive it or learn about its states of transformation. For Parmenides, in order to gain knowledge and clarity, we must reflect on the same qualities that unites each object: "[A thing is] changeless in the coils of huge bonds, without beginning or cessation … remaining the same and in the same state, it lies by itself and remains thus where it is perpetually, for strong necessity holds it in the bondage of a limit, which keeps it apart … it is not lawful that Being should be incomplete for it is not defective, whereas Not-being would lack everything"[20] For Parmenides, becoming remains in bondage since it cannot be actualised. By reflecting upon what remains the same we

[19] Parmenides, Section 66 in *The Fragments of Parmenides*, revised edition, original trans. by A. H Coxon, ed. and new trans. by Richard McKirahan (Las Vegas: Parmenides Publishing, 2009) p.70
[20] Ibid, Section 68-70, pp.72-4

overcome this problem. This is to reflect on the timeless quality of an object (what remains the same about X over time?) These timeless qualities then enable us to gain a complete idea of things in the world. For instance, the life cycle of a bee enables us to understand the production of honey and its function in a hive.

In contrast, Heraclitus takes an 'empirical' and pluralist position that affirms becoming. This is because for Heraclitus fire is used as a metaphor for explaining how the world is in flux. "All things are exchanged for fire and fire for all things, just as wares for gold and gold for wares."[21] For Heraclitus, everything in the world is perishable since everything can be destroyed with fire. Or to put it another way, nothing in the world is everlasting but only lasts a brief period of time. As James Hillman remarks: "[Heraclitus'] name for this changing flux, or process, in today's terms, is 'fire,' a metaphor for the shifting meanings of all truth. Therefore, the verbal account, or *logos*, of the world is also fire. Truth, wisdom, knowledge, reality-none can stand apart from this fire that allows no objective fixity."[22] However, fire should not only a destructive force but also a creative one. By erasing prior structures of knowledge we can build arrive at new understandings of the world. This is a continual cyclical process of needing to continually eradicate prior structures of knowledge in order to always arrive at different perspectives. In this way, everything remains transitory with nothing remaining everlasting expect the process of transformation itself. Deleuze's relates these two opposing positions to the discussion of language in Plato's *Cratylus*:

---

[21] Heraclitus, *The Fragments of the Work of Heraclitus of Ephesus on Nature*, trans. by G.T.W. Patrick (Baltimore: N. Murray, 1889) Available at http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/heraclitus/herpate.htm [accessed 18th April 2015]

[22] James Hillman, 'Foreword' in Heraclitus, Fragments, trans. by Brooks Haxton (London: Viking, 2001) Available at https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=bVxk39znNwIC&pg=PT96&dq=heraclitus+fragments&hl=en&sa=X&ei=KD0yVeiOOZbfau3ogFg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 18th April 2015]

> Sometimes Plato wonders whether this pure becoming might not have a peculiar relation to language. This seems to be one of the principal meanings of the *Cratylus* ... could this relation, perhaps, be essential to language ... might there not be two sorts of languages ... or further still, is it not possible that there are two distinct dimensions to language in general?[23]

Although not explicit referenced by Deleuze, these two contrasting positions in the *Cratylus* are represented in the views of Hermogenes and Cratylus. It is then through Plato's resolution of these positions that he must take into consideration the role and function of pure becoming and the attainment of meaning. By taking this into consideration we either arrive two separate forms of language, private and general use of names. Or, that becoming and structure paradoxically function within language itself. Following this, we cannot take Deleuze's position as anti-Platonic. I then disagree with Miguel de Beistegui's view where Plato's philosophy is to be overcome. This is because a method of judgment introduced negates multiplicity in preference to the One: "Deleuze will not cease to attack [Platonism] and try [to] overturn [it] by revealing … [its desire] to introduce judgment in philosophy (in the plane of immanence), and give it a (preferably bad) conscience."[24] In contrast to this, I agree with Daniel W. Smith's view where we must then revaluate the role of simulacra and its relation to structure, rather than, completely dismiss it altogether: "Deleuze's [philosophy] … must not be taken as a rejection of Platonism … Deleuze's inverted Platonism retrieves almost every aspect of the Platonic project, but now reconceived from the viewpoint of the simulacrum itself."[25] By taking

[23] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p. 2
[24] Miguel de Beistegui, 'The Deleuzian reversal of Platonism' in *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* ed. by Henry Somers-Hall and Daniel W. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) p.57
[25] Daniel W. Smith, *Essays on Deleuze*, p.16

simulacra into account: “it shows how Plato failed in his attempt to ‘make the difference,’ but at the same time it opens up a path towards a retrieval of the Platonic project on a new basis. In this sense, Deleuze’s inverted Platonism can at the same time be seen as a rejuvenated Platonism and even a completed Platonism.”[26] We will now consider the role and function of pure becoming in Plato’s *Cratylus*. The next chapter will continue this discussion analysing their role in Deleuze’s in *Logic of Sense* through Alice’s apprenticeship in Lewis Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*.

Plato’s Cratylus: the problem of naming and maintaining uniqueness

The *Cratylus* aims to discover the universal and causal basis that explains the reason for the diversity of names and meanings. This discovery occurs through Hermogenes, a follower of Socrates, who seeks Socrates’ assistance in clarifying Cratylus’ view. As Hermogenes states at the beginning of dialogue: “Cratylus says, Socrates, that there is a correctness of name for each thing, one that belongs to it by nature. A thing’s name isn’t whatever people agree to call it—some bit of their native language that applies to it—but there is a natural correctness of names, which is the same for everyone, Greek or foreigner.”[27] I have so far illustrated the problem of naming through the negation of singularity. This is because each time we attribute a name to a particular object, we refer to its general qualities. This view was related to Leibniz’s philosophy of language where naming presents a lack since we are incapable to express uniqueness.

[26] Ibid
[27] Cratylus 383b in Plato, *Plato Complete Works*, ed. by John M. Cooper and D.S. Hutchinson, trans. by G.D.C. Reeve (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997)

This inability to adequately express singularity can also be identified in Hermogenes' frustrated response in asking Cratylus his name: "... I ask [Cratylus] whether his own name is truly 'Cratylus'. He agrees that it is ... 'Does this also hold for everyone else? Is the name we call him his name?' 'It certainly doesn't hold of you.'"[28] For Cratylus, a name does not truly express who we are since we must connect a given name to a thing, as Timothy M. S. Baxter explains: "It matters not that people who know Hermogenes know him as *Hermogenes*. Some kind of 'glue' must link name and thing. And this turns out to be the describing of his nature. Since nothing of the semantic analysis of Hermogenes seems to fit the man conventionally so named, the name, when applied to that particular man, is just a piece of speech, mere hot air."[29] We can understand Hermogenes' confusion at this since it is through our use of names that we have a sense of personal identity. For instance, when a friend, family member or loved one calls us by our name we recognise that it is us that they are addressing. Yet, even though each of us is given a name, it is not truly unique. This shock to our sense of personal identity is apparent when searching for our name on a social media website such as Facebook or twitter. In searching, we are presented with sometimes a few or even a seemingly innumerable amount of other individuals with the same name. It is then through a seemingly innocent task that we penetrate the deeper philosophical nature of questioning our own personal identity. Who am I if X amount of people share the same name? What makes me unique?

Before a discussion of Cratylus' view is made, Hermogenes gives his own

[28] Ibid
[29] Timothy M.S. Baxter, *The Cratylus: Plato's Critique of Naming* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1992) p.10

opinion on names: “no one is able to persuade me that the correctness of names is determined by anything besides convention and agreement. I believe that any name you give a thing is its correct name.”[30] Hermogenes’ solution in order to maintain uniqueness is through the use of proper names (a private use of language). As he remarks “I call a thing by the name I gave it; you call it by the different name you gave it.”[31] Following Hermogenes’ view, a singular language should be created in order to maintain each individual’s own understanding. Each individual would then have his or her own different use of language with their own set of vocabulary and meanings. Hermogenes’ foundation for correctness is then based upon an individual’s ability to create their own rules and usage of language: “No name belongs to a particular thing by nature, but only because of the rules and usage of those who establish the usage and call it by that name.”[32] It is then not an external foundation that individuals need to reflect upon in order for them to arrive at a correct understanding of the world. This is because, for Hermogenes, individuals are free to create whatever use of language they see fit.

However, from this basis of pure creativity, we are not lead into a metaphysics of pure difference. This is because, comparable to Locke, we will adopt novel uses of language. For Hermogenes, this process explains the reason for the diversity of languages: “In the same … [practice of attributing names] I see that different communities have different names for the same things—Greeks differing from other Greeks, and Greeks from foreigners.”[33] In this way, individuals will gradually adopt

[30] Cratylus, 384d
[31] Cratylus, 385d
[32] Ibid, 384d
[33] Ibid, 385e

more uses of a private language in order for it to differ locally within a country. For instance, there is regional variation of the Scottish language, as Fiona Douglas remarks "the term *Scots* … is generally held to include localised Scottish vernaculars known variously as *broad Scots* or *dialect Scots*, for example, rural or more traditional varieties such as the *Ayrshire dialectic* or the *Doric* of northeastern Scotland."[34] This local adoption will then gradually increase to a regional level. This is evident by the different variations of English language within Britain in Scotland, England, Ireland and Wales. Once there has been an overall adoption of a dominant vernacular use of language this will enable us to understand the different emergence of languages in other countries such as French, German, Spanish and so forth.

Therefore, in Hermogenes' view (as Leibniz would also later remark) our dominant use of language came into being through the popularisation of a private use of language. This process is then dynamic and allows for the novel use of language to then eventually transform the entire foundation and structure of the mother tongue. For instance, this process explains the emergence of Modern English in the 17th and 18th as Ute Dons explains "The main reason for the beginning of an English grammar tradition in the sixteenth century was the change in the cultural climate due to the movements of Renaissance, Reformation, and Humanism … [these] raised the desire among the English people to similarly refine and enlarge the means of expression of their own language."[35] This was no easy task since: "… at the time, English possessed neither a standardized grammar nor a binding spelling system. Pronunciation varied considerably in the sixteenth century, while the

[34] Fiona Douglas, *Scottish Newspapers, Language and Identity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009) p.33
[35] Ute Dons, *Descriptive Adequacy of Early Modern English Grammars*, (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer, 2004) p.4

lexicon was relatively limited as Latin, the language of the scholars and the sciences was traditionally preferred for complex subject matters."[36] Despite this dominance of Latin: "… most scholars were aware of the potential of the English language and tried to increase the acceptance of their mother tongue. Their efforts to lay down rules for the English language … resulted in the publication of numerous grammars, dictionaries, and essays about orthography and spelling."[37]

Plato illustrates a problem of nonsense in Hermogenes' view: "Suppose I call one of the things that are— for instance, the one we now call 'man'—suppose I give *that* the name 'horse' and give the one we now call 'horse' the name 'man'."[38] If we attempted to give a different name than what was socially acceptable then we appear to be idiotic. It is then not based upon our own choice to give names to things. This is because names are determined by their social and cultural usage. If every individual used a different name we would also be unable to clearly understand the idea that was attempting to be communicated. For instance, if I stated 'I loved that blurp, did you love it too?' The other individual is initially clueless about what blurp meant but then corrects them according to what they know from their experience, 'By blurp don't you mean the film?' In the most extreme instances, nothing would be understood by anyone at all 'znip znack znool?' In this case, we have nothing from our experience to associate each particular word. This is further problematized when the other individual replies back in another set of nonsensical words, 'Zi! Snaj jurip nip bip.' Therefore we must adhere to the social and cultural accepted meaning of name at a given time. This allows for us to communicate and

[36] Ibid, pp.4-5
[37] Ibid, p.5
[38] Cratylus, 385e

reflect upon the same ideas thereby avoid problems of nonsense since we can associate ideas to particular things from our experience.

Plato's criticism connects Hermogenes' view with the pre-Socratic philosopher Protagoras. Plato quotes Protagoras' famous relativist statement: "… man is the measure of all things' and that things are to me as they appear to me, and are to you as they appear to you."[39] For Protagoras, we arrive at a subjective foundation where our knowledge and judgment is based upon our own relative taste (I like X and I don't like Y, she does not like X but does like Y). Or we might read the term man in the case for humanity and not a male, as Catherine Osborne remarks "we might read 'man' in 'man is the measure as a reference to human society as a whole. If so, Protagoras meant that the conventions of your society determine for you what does and what doesn't count as a matter of importance."[40] Despite this slight difference in interpretation Protagoras argues that truth is a human creation: "… Protagoras appears to say that there is no independent truth about what things exist, or what they like, apart from the way human beings construct them for themselves."[41] His relativist view also applies to morality where: "… societies form their own codes of moral conduct and legal systems, and that what was right for one society need not be right for another."[42]

[39] Ibid, 386a
[40] Catherine Osborne, Presocratic Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) Available at https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=4QO_2YHyv4cC&printsec=frontcover&dq=very+short+introduction+presocratics&hl=en&sa=X&ei=dekjVZO_NtCxae-MgNgF&ved=0CCEQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false [date accessed 7th April 2015]
[41] Ibid
[42] Ibid

For Plato, Protagoras' relativism proves to be problematical when applied to learning: "if what each person believes to be true *is* true for him, no one can truly be wiser than anyone else."[43] Comparable to Stirner's egoism, every individual's judgment is correct since they must arrive at knowledge for themselves. However, Plato's critical remark highlights a problem of apprenticeship and education. This is because without a given method in order to instruct us we have no need for a process of learning. Without any method we cannot know whether our opinion is correct or incorrect. This leads to a chaotic situation where any given opinion, technique or style would be deemed as correct (It doesn't matter how I hold the hammer, whatever works for me). Heda Segvic remarks that this problem reoccurs in the dialogue on Protagoras: "[Socrates'] dissatisfaction with Protagoras' position is likely to turn upon Protagoras' uncritical attitude toward 'appearances', and especially upon the received or socially accepted standards of goodness."[44] From this, we can see that a universal standard must be created. This universal standard allows for an educational system where individuals can be taught what is correct and incorrect. We thereby avoid harm towards others or ourselves (if I hold the hammer in the correct way I won't hurt myself or potentially others.)

Plato's third criticism of Hermogenes is in relation to Euthydemus' view that: "… everything always has every attribute simultaneously."[45] For Euthydemus, an infinite set of possibilities is contained within any finite thing. This view seems initially strange since we can immediately reply that any given object is finite and limited to a given set of properties (X has properties A, B, C). However, these properties are not

[43] Ibid, 386d
[44] Heda Segvic, *From Protagoras to Aristotle: Essays in Ancient Moral Philosophy*, ed. by Myles Burnyeat (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2009) p.26
[45] Cratylus, 386d

eternal since they can change over time (X now has properties A, B, and D). Due to this any possible combination of qualities can be applied to it (The redesign of Y has transformed Z completely). This allows us to change overcome initial view of its limitation to being open to an infinite possible combination of qualities that a given object can contain. In philosophical terms, difference is inherent to a given object. It is through the act of actualising these changes that reflect its inherent differences (the redesign of Y was thought of as improving the qualities of A, B, C).

For instance, we can relate Protagoras' view to the development of modern technology. The infinite possibility of how an object can function can be seen in the evolution of Nintendo's hand held consoles. For the Nintendo DS, there are specific qualities that can be identified: two separate LCD screens, the lower screen being touch screen, a stylus in order to enable the user to effectively use the touch screen and two separate controls, one to control movement and the other for actions. Each Nintendo model has this basic design yet each has a different set of unique properties such as the Nintendo DS XL (2009) has larger screens that its predecessors and the Nintendo 3DS (2011) is the only model capable of playing games in a 3D format.

For Plato, Euthydemus' view is problematical since we would unable to reach a clear definition of each object. Or to put it another way, we are no longer able to clearly define what makes each thing unique. (If X and Y both have property Z what makes them distinct?) We then return to an educational system where our knowledge is timely and limited to a given period. In order to maintain a correct view we must continually alter our methodologies and prior forms of knowledge. This

leads to a problem for an educational system since our knowledge is flawed and continually corrected. In this way, we continually fix prior incorrect forms of knowledge by updating them. For Plato, an educational system should be based upon one set of definition that always remains correct:

> … if neither [Euthydemus or Protagoras] is right, if it isn't the case that everything always has every attribute simultaneously [Euthydemus' view] or that each thing has a being or essence privately for each person [Protagoras' view], then it is clear that things have some fixed being or essence of their own. They are not in relation to us and are not made to fluctuate by how they appear to us. *They are by themselves, in relation to their own being or essence, which is theirs by nature*.[46]

In contrast to Hermogenes, Protagoras or Euthydemus, a basis for knowledge is not upon our own relative choice but rather a natural foundation. This natural foundation, for Plato, is based upon using a tool in the adherence to the structure that it was designed for: "an action's performance accords with the action's own nature, and not with what we believe. Suppose, for example, that we undertake to cut something. If we make the cut in whatever way *we* choose and with whatever tool *we* choose, we will not succeed in cutting."[47] In order to correctly cut something it: "… if in each case we choose to cut in accord with the nature of cutting and being cut and the natural tool for cutting, we'll succeed and cut correctly."[48] In order to be correct then it must adhere to a methodology that teaches us how to correctly and incorrectly to use it. Following this methodology we are then able to make a rational choice that is good

[46] Ibid, 386e
[47] Cratylus, 387a
[48] Ibid

for us since it enables us to correctly apply our knowledge.

Plato on Cratylus' view: etymology and problems with a causal foundation for meaning

We have so far identified that a foundation for language must be universal. By affirming variances we arrive at multiple foundations based upon each individual's relative view. Plato's problem with Hermogenes', Protagoras and Euthydemus is that they do not explain similarities or points of comparison. We should then seek to discover a foundation to explain how variances occur. This process of identification of a universal foundation is achieved through rational deduction. This is because it is through the process of rational deduction that we move from the Many to the One. Or to put it another way, from a multiplicity of perspectives to one clear view. Cratylus' view is then analysed since he advocates the use of both techniques. As we have seen for Cratylus that our current means of expression lacks the ability to adequately connect name and thing. This is because of the amount of competing claims for the same name.

As Plato states "… Our fine modern language has obliterated the true meaning of these names by so twisting them around that they now mean the opposite of what they used to, whereas the ancient language expresses clearly what they mean."[49] The continual transformation of word of over time then negates its original meaning. This is because a word will constantly take on new meaning, significations, and pronunciations. *Time and timeliness then has a destructive effect on its original*

[49] Cratylus, 418b

constitution (X used to mean Y but now means Z). Therefore, for Cratylus, we must affirm an etymological approach. By using this approach we can reverse the destructive effect of time and by return to a word's original meaning.

By reversing the effects of the transformation of a word, we return to understand the how a word is formed and in the context of the time in which it is used. This can be seen in Anatoly Liberman's etymology of the word *daisy*: "The word *daisy* first surfaced in a manuscript going back to the year 1000 [AD], that is, to the time about two centuries after the emergence of the earliest texts in the English language … [the term was coined] probably after 450, the date given for the invasion of Britain by Germanic tribes, since no word like daisy has been recorded on the continent. "[50] During this period when individuals spoke Old English: "… the daisy [was called] dœ*ges eage* (pronounced approximately as 'day-z éay-e', with *ea* as in the French name Réamur.)"[51] The phrase: "… meant 'day's eye,' either because the daisy resembles the sun … or because it covers the yellow disk in the evening and opens it in the morning."[52] By performing this etymology of the English for daisy we then return to an age where: "… things revealed their nature in words, and words captured the most salient features of things. Happy cave dwellers exchanged nosegays of day's eyes, and no one needed lessons in etymology."[53]

In order to test whether etymological is indeed the best foundation for

[50] Anatoly Liberman, *Word Origins and How We Know Them: Etymology for Everyone* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) p.7
[51] Ibid
[52] Ibid
[53] Ibid, p.8

meaning, Plato uses an etymological technique in order to analyze various words. His adoption of this technique follows a traditional one at the time, as Francesco Ademollo remarks "At a first stage Socrates' analyses follow the … standard one in Greek etymology before and after Plato – names are more or less disguised descriptions of their referents, deriving either from one single word or from more words conflated together …"[54] The etymological section of the *Cratylus* is quite detailed, as Michael W. Riley explains "Socrates goes on a lengthy tangent that finally takes over and takes up most of the dialogues."[55] The level of etymological analysis given by Plato is, of course, not comparable to modern standards of research: "The set of some 140 etymologies for 108 names that Socrates provides in this tangent consists of derivations almost entirely specious by modern standards. [By comparison to modern standards] Louis Meridier [in the preface to the French 1950 edition of the Cratylus] lists only twenty successful or partially successful etymologies, about a seventh of the total."[56] Despite these problems, Liberman notes the value in Plato's etymology: "Let us admire Socrates who was fluent only in Greek but understood so much about language and repeat the watchword of etymological research: original 'names' were conventional (for other sounds could have expressed the same meaning) but not arbitrary (the speakers who chose those sounds had a reason to do so. The entire science of etymology is centered on finding that reason."[57]

[54] Francesco Ademollo, *The Cratylus of Plato: A Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) p.181
[55] Michael W. Riley, *Plato's Cratylus: Argument, Form and Structure* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2005) p.1
[56] Ibid
[57] Liberman, *Words Origins and How We Know Them*, p.15

Plato's interest with etymology is to identify problems in the investigator's process of selection. This is where specific instances are privileged as the true origins for a word. In order to illustrate this point, Plato discusses an example taken from Hesiod's *Theogony* that has continued into modern day, that is, by incorrectly using the word Sphinx instead of '*Phix*'. As Stanley Lombardo remarks in the notes to the Theogony: "Chimaira is probably the mother of the Sphinx (or rather the 'Phiks' – this local variant of 'Sphinx' is the single example of Boeotian dialect in the Hesiodic corpus) ..."[58] For Plato, although the single example of Boeotian dialectic, this remains important since it challenges the popular etymology which "… inappropriately connects *'Sphinx'* with a verb meaning 'to torture'. *'Phix',* the Boeotian form of the word, connects it more appropriately with Mount Phikion in Boeotia, because of the special association of the Sphinx with Thebes."[59] We should then relate the correct our use of the word Sphinx to 'Phix' in order to relate it to the Greek myth. This is where a Sphinx guarded the gates to the entrance of the city of Thebes (which in the Boeotian region of Greece) and asked a riddle in order travellers to safe passage. If answered incorrectly she devoured them. Oedipus famously solves this riddle in Sophocles' play *Oedipus the King* (c.429 BC).

It is therefore through the process of selection that is problematical since a rational judgment can only be made through the evidence provided. In terms of scientific analysis for etymology is problematical since it attempts to trace an origin from fragments of data. The problem then is there is always a possibility of finding new evidence that can contradict or challenge a previous hypothesis. This can be seen in Liberman's analysis of trying to find an origin for the Old Scandanavian name

[58] Hesiod, *Work and Days and Theogony* trans. by Stanley Lombardo (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993) p.95
[59] Hesiod, *Theogony* 326.

Heiðrún but keeps on finding different explanations. Icelandic myth states that "*Heiðrún* is a goat from whose udder a never-ceasing stream of mead flows."[60] A breakdown of the name reveals each separate meaning: "*Heið[brightness of the sky]* or [heath], or [honor] and *rún* [rune], but the whole makes little sense when applied to a goat."[61] Nevertheless: "… a heavenly goat is a character in many myths … so that *Heiðrún*'s name could not be bestowed upon it by chance or by mistake."[62] Liberman then remembers of the: "the English noun *heifer* … [and looked up its definition] in Skeat, the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and a few other easily available books. They offered conflicting solutions and gave no references to their competitors or predecessors. Some cited the Old English form *heahfore* and stopped there …"[63] Still determined to find the origin Liberman consulted: "the eleventh edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica['s entry] all of which is devoted to the etymology of the word [Heifer]. Surprisingly, the Britannica etymology is different from every other one I have seen."[64] Finally dejected after a period of: "… half a year to collect an insufficient bibliography of heifer, and I shuddered at the thought that the next project would be even more time consuming."[65]

For Plato, an etymological analysis cannot return to the original meaning due to the multiplicity of opinions that claim to be its correct interpretation. Due to this, an ancient names are equally as distorted as modern ones: "Names have been twisted in so many ways, indeed, that it wouldn't be surprising if the ancient Greek word was

[60] Liberman, *Words Origins and How We Know Them*, pp.1-2
[61] Ibid, p.2
[62] Ibid
[63] Ibid, p.2
[64] Ibid, pp.2-3
[65] Ibid, p.3

the same as the modern foreign one …"[66] Regardless then of its time period, an empirical analysis of meaning still remains timely. What is then analysed is not the meaning itself but rather its transformation over time. Plato's etymological analysis then illustrates a problem of underdetermination that is still relevant to modern philosophy of science, as Andrew Gregory notes: "In modern philosophy of science there is a problem known as underdetermination. In short, in order to determine which theory to adopt the data (however good) are insufficient and non-empirical criteria must be employed."[67] As shown in the problems of etymology: "Plato recognised some of the difficulties here, albeit in a rather more general form … Plato then develops a solution involving teleology."[68] This can be identified in the second process stage of Plato's etymological analysis where a different approach must be used, as Adernollo states "Socrates will face the problem of accounting for those names that cannot be analysed further into more elementary names. This will call for a different kind of etymologies, based rather on the *mimetic power* of the letters/sounds that constitute a name."[69] This mimetic power of letters and sounds is their ability to reflect the same Idea.

Plato's view: towards a metaphysics of language

For Plato, due to the problems of timeliness, we must then reach a timeless or untimely foundation: "… if we ever get hold of a name that isn't composed out of other names, we'll be right to say that at last we've reached an element, which cannot any longer be carried back to other names."[70] The remainder of the *Cratylus*

[66] Plato, Cratylus, 421d
[67] Andrew Gregory, *Plato's Philosophy of Science* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015) p.6
[68] Ibid
[69] Francesco Ademollo, *The Cratylus of Plato: A Commentary*, p.181
[70] Plato, Cratylus, 422b

demonstrates how we can arrive at a metaphysical foundation for language based upon mimesis/copying of the Idea. Plato notes how in relation to speech we must imitate an Idea in order to be understood: “It seems to follow that a name is a vocal imitation of what it imitates, and that someone who imitates something with his voice names what he imitates.”[71] In relation to speech, we must imitate the correct tonal utterances of names in order to be understood (X muttered, Y asked them to state what they said again clearly.) In philosophical terms, each imitation of a word is a simulacrum, an imperfect copy of the original. We then imperfectly imitate the original idea through speech. For instance, in order to imitate an animal we must copy its sounds and actions (X said meow, what an uninspiring impression of a cat.)

For Plato, it is from this basis of mimicking an Idea that we can understand how words are formed: “… it isn't every man who can give names, Hermogenes, but only a namemaker, and he, it seems, is a rule-setter—the kind of craftsman most rarely found among human beings.”[72] The namemaker or craftsman has undertaken an apprenticeship to be trained to correctly form words. The correct formation of words is based upon the natural combination of sounds: “… Cratylus is right in saying that things have natural names, and that not everyone is a craftsman of names, but only someone who looks to the natural name of each thing and is able to put its form into letters and syllables.”[73] It is then only an individual who is able to rationally reflect upon the structure itself that can select the best combination of tones to form a word. For Plato the craftsman of words or wordsmith is comparable to any craftsman such as a carpenter. This is because a carpenter also looks to a

[71] Ibid, 423b
[72] Ibid, 388b
[73] Ibid, 390

structure or blueprint in order to create their work. By adhering to this structure it enables a carpenter to correctly build their work and also teach others. In the same way, a wordsmith then uses a natural combination of words that adhere to the same pre-given form or structure. Therefore, despite any difference in language (X for Y or Z for Y) the same structure will have been adhered to.

This structure will be taken into account into the very construction of the name itself where: “the rule-setter apparently used the other letters or elements as likenesses in order to make a sign or name for each of the things that are, and then compounded all the remaining names out of these, imitating the things they name.”[74] Every different component of a name, its syllables and even rhythm express an Idea. This creates an effectual relationship between its expression and its signification (the bodily expression X corresponds to signification Y). In order to illustrate this point, Plato uses the example of the Greek word for round ‘gongulon’ that is created with lots of ‘o’s’: “[the rule setter] wanted *'o'* to signify roundness, so he mixed lots of it into the name *'gongulon'* ('round').”[75] When the word gongulon is spoken our mouth goes into an ‘o’ shape which then copies the Idea of roundness.

Plato’s model for the wordsmith enables an educational system to be created. This is because any new language that is correct must always adhere to the same Ideas. A model of judgment of language then is to be adhered to in order to prevent a complete deviation from the Idea or structure altogether: “the best possible way to speak consists in using names all (or most) of which are like the things they name (that is, are appropriate to them), while the worst is to use the opposite kind of

[74] Ibid, 427d
[75] Ibid

names."[76] Plato does allow for the namemaker or craftsman to make mistakes: "even if a name doesn't include all the appropriate letters, it will still describe the thing if it includes its pattern—though it will describe the thing well, if it includes all the appropriate letters, and badly, if it includes few of them."[77] A word may not be a perfect copy of the model but still conveys the essence of the Idea or structure (X may not be perfect representation of Y but still represents the idea of Z). This variance of the namemakers style in creating a word explains how foreign languages emerged. This is because, for Plato, namemakers will have deviated in their use of language in order to express the same Idea. However, a completely nonsensical or absurd word cannot be counted as a name since it lacks any relation to the original Idea: "if you deny it, you cannot agree that a name is correct if it expresses things by means of letters and syllables and you'll have to search for some other account of the correctness of names."[78] In this way, a dialectical relation between a new word and an existing signification must be upheld as dissimilarity between a word and sign negates the use of language altogether by means of absurdity.

In order to make sure the namemaker adheres to the correct formation a dialectician, an individual skilled in the art of philosophical debate, must supervise them: "it's the work of a rule-setter, it seems, to make a name. And if names are to be given well, a dialectician must supervise him."[79] This is because the philosopher will enable the wordsmith to rationally reflect upon the form or ideal structure, rather than, base their understanding upon opinion. Plato is then making explicit reference

[76] Ibid, 434e
[77] Ibid, 432e
[78] Ibid
[79] Ibid, 390d

to the elenchus or Socratic method. This is to move from a multiplicity of opinions based upon our initial experiential idea of the world, to a generalization of these qualities and finally arriving at the Idea, the point of convergence and synthesis of these various points. For instance, we can identify the Socratic method in the dialogue structure of the *Meno*. It begins with a discussion of various virtues: "… a man's virtue consists of being able to manage public affairs and in doing so to benefit his friends and harm his enemies and to be careful that no harm comes to himself … And there are very many other virtues, so that one is not at a loss to say what virtue is."[80] After Socrates dissatisfaction with this answer Meno gives a general definition that applies to everyone: "… virtue is to desire beautiful things and have the power to acquire them."[81] Even after this general answer Socrates' still remains dissatisfied and Meno frustrated by this point responds with the famous paradox: "How will you look for it, Socrates, when you do not know at all what it is? How will you aim to search for something you do not know at all? If you should meet with it, how will you know that this is the thing that you did not know?"[82]

From this we can see that Meno affirms an empirical view and challenges Socrates' rationalism. This is because for Meno we learn from our immediate experience of objects and also use this as a basis to discover new things in the world (as a combination of prior associations). If knowledge is metaphysical, our idea is blank and so we would neither know what it looks like nor be able to discover it in the world. Socrates then gives the response of how knowledge is attained through

[80] Meno, 71e-72a in Plato, *Five Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo*, 2nd edition, trans. by G.M.A Grube (Indiana: Hackett, 2002)
[81] Ibid, 77b
[82] Ibid, 80d

recollection, which is illustrated by Meno's slave arriving at a correct understanding of geometry despite having no prior experiential knowledge of it. In philosophical terms, this means that rational reflection upon a structure, comparable to mathematics enables us to arrive at the timeless definitions. As Julia Annas remarks "Socrates has taught the boy in the sense of presenting the proof to him in such a way that the boy can come to have knowledge of it for himself. The boy will not actually have knowledge until he has done something for himself – making the effort to understand the proof."[83] Socrates' teaching method then enables individuals' to think for themselves: "[Socrates] can convey the proof to the boy in a way that will enable the boy to make the effort for himself. Hence we can see how knowledge can be teachable while it is still true that knowledge is something each person can achieve only for himself."[84] Therefore much like Meno's slave we are not presented with a precise definition of virtue, but rather, we should arrive at it for ourselves by following this method of rational deduction.

Conclusion

Plato therefore resolves the problems of pure difference and pure meaning in Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views. In Hermogenes' view, our sense must always take precedence over meaning. Each individual's unique understanding then can only be maintained through the use of proper names and adopt a private use of language. Due to Hermogenes' radical affirmation of uniqueness there is a complete denial of shared meaning and understandings. Plato illustrates that without any shared understanding an idea cannot be clearly understood. In order to be understood by others our sense must still have a relation to social and culturally

[83] Julia Annas, *Plato: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) p.9
[84] Ibid

defined terms. In philosophical terms, we cannot solely affirm pure difference or becoming. This is because there is no structure but a process. Or to put it another way, we arrive at various examples but no precise definition. Knowledge then must be defined according to a structure that allows others to be educated and to develop *their own* technique. The development of one's own technique is then not to affirm the relativism of Hermogenes, Protagoras or Euthydemus. For Plato, an individual's own technique can emerge through the use of the general methodology, rather than having to have radically different approaches for everyone.

In Cratylus' view meaning must always take precedence over sense. This is why the etymological takes precedence in the dialogue since it allows for an individual to trace the history of a word to its original meaning. The problem highlighted by Plato is then the act of tracing itself. We can be lead into error by tracing an incorrect origin. This is not a problem of reason but the evidence that is presented at a given time. In this way, through the use of etymology we arrive at meaning and structure but its foundation does not remain stable. This is because there are other possible claims for the correct origin. In order to arrive at a stable foundation all various competing claims must be overcome in preference to the One, a metaphysical and timeless foundation for meaning.

Plato's resolution of Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views is where both meaning and sense are affirmed. This is achieved through the use of a general methodology and pure meaning. A general methodology allows for all individuals to be taught the same methods. For Plato, regardless that the methodology itself may vary or differ over time the same Idea will be able to be reflected upon. This can be seen through

the various incarnations of a name over time that are still able to reflect the same Idea. It is through the education of these Ideas or pure meanings that we can attain a correct understanding. This is because we are able to move from uncertainty to clarity, or from a multiplicity of possible senses to a clear and certain definition. Plato's model for language therefore emerges between chaos and universal order neither destroyed nor completely regulated, a perfect imperfection. The next chapter will return to this dynamic between sense and meaning in relation to Deleuze's reading of Lewis Carroll in *Logic of Sense*. In contrast to Plato, it will be argued that Deleuze does not seek to construct a transcendent structure for meaning. Deleuze seeks an immanent model that affirms the continual change of sense over time. In this way, we do not always fall into error but allow for our own understanding to change and a multiplicity of perspectives to have a positive influence on our knowledge.

6

Logic of Sense and Lewis Carroll: Challenging the pure foundation of meaning by rediscovering sense

Introduction

In my thesis I have identified that in both rationalist and empiricist approaches meaning must be based upon a metaphysical foundation. Yet we never attain full meaning for them. This is because things lack names and only retain purely sensual information. In order to move from understanding to knowledge, sense to meaning, we must impose general names. In the rationalist model, experiential definitions always remain incorrect. This is because everything worldly is in a continual state of flux. A definition would never be able to accurately represent the present state of change. Likewise, in relation to the empiricist model, without the process of association that generalises of our experiential knowledge we remain without secure ideas. In both models then a process of generalisation is necessary in order to attain knowledge. In the introduction, I demonstrated the problems of nonsense in a private use of language in Locke. This problem is also apparent in Descartes' method of doubt where our experiential knowledge is nonsensical, since we cannot arrive at a clear and distinct understanding of the world from experience. Therefore general names and the use of rational deduction enable the act of communication to take place and to confirm that another individual understands us. This is because language signifies a given worldly object and expressing our thoughts. When a word is uttered we are able to identify which specific object or thing that is being referred

to. At the same time, there is a psychological aspect revealed in the rhetorical nature of the communication itself that expresses our feelings towards it.

How then does language that begins with an expression of worldly objects become metaphysical? The answer is through the establishment of meaning. In other words, the problem is to establish a certain and permanent foundation for knowledge. In the empirical model this is to establish a causal principle. The causal principle then acts as the basis for all subsequent changes that occur. In the rationalist model, a transcendent signifier is established through the process of rational deduction. In both models then the aim is to create a metaphysical foundation in order for our understanding to always attain a correct understanding and knowledge of the world. Without this metaphysical structure, based upon causal principles and transcendent signifiers, we are left in a purely child-like state, in a world of blank words and nonsense. From this the rationalist and empirical models then create an image of thought in order for an apprenticeship to take place. This is to be guided by principles that can be practically applied and used by all individuals. A benefit then is that it does not lead to harm of others or ourselves through a misuse of knowledge.

Deleuze challenges this traditional model consistently through his reading of Proust and in *Difference and Repetition*. He seeks to arrive at a different image of thought that emphasises sense and the importance of immanence. In this way, thought is not to be considered as solely based upon an eternal structure but rather as a process where the structure itself is affected and transformed by our own practical application and by immanent forces. Deleuze's definition of thought as a

process can be connected to Merleau-Ponty's view which states "language is neither thing nor mind, but it is immanent and transcendent at the same time"[1] Language then no longer expresses an actual object or our thought but the metaphysical structure and the immanent forces that affect that structure. In *Logic of Sense*, Deleuze remarks "It is language which fixes the limits ... but it is language as well which transcends the limits and restores them to the infinite equivalence of an unlimited becoming."[2] Language then enables us to have structure through predefined meanings. Yet as we have seen through Deleuze's reading of Proust in chapter 4, the aim of an apprenticeship is to become an Egyptologist. The decipherer of signs makes sense of them but not by repeating and reiterating the same meaning (Describe what a tree looks like? Which one of these is not a spoon?).

Deleuze's apprenticeship then contrasts with the traditional rationalist and empirical models. This is because his apprenticeship does not begin with the process of making sense. Instead it begins with a proliferation of meaning. In this way, there is nothing to initially make sense of since everything has been predefined by our social and cultural backgrounds. What we learn is corrected according to accepted truths at a given time. For Deleuze, at this point there is nothing to truly think about, and our thoughts must conform or be corrected. As we have seen in the previous chapter, what defines the new image of thought is that we must think differently. In *Proust and Signs*, a Leibnizian apprenticeship is to affirm the monadic singularity of understanding and different viewpoints from our own. Deleuze's

[1] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Consciousness and the Acquisition of Language* trans. Hugh J. Silverman by (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1979) p.6
[2] Gilles Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, ed. by Constantin V. Boundas, trans. by Mark Lester and Charles Stivale (London: Continuum, 2004) p.4

Difference and Repetition further develops this metaphysics based upon pure difference. Yet what must be emphasised is the immanent relation to the world (the singularity of leaves, of our appearance). This overcomes the problem of dualism as expressed by Peter Hallward in the introduction to the thesis. Deleuze does not seek to affirm an either/or position, either an empirical or a rationalist position, since he demonstrates the relationship between experience and the rational structures that govern it. In philosophical terms, becoming and actuality are not two opposing philosophical models (Heraclitus contra Paramenides). Our understanding requires structure and models in order to learn and, at the same time, transformation of these models occurs through their practical application. This is because a model is transformed by reacting to the worldly forces at a given time (How does Plato help to enable us to understand African American discrimination?)

Plato's criticisms in the previous chapter on the *Cratylus* revealed problems in empirical and rational approaches. Hermogenes' empirical view that affirmed a private use of language was flawed through the need to use general terms in order for our ideas to be understood. Cratylus' rational view privileged the etymological origin as the basis for meaning. This was shown to be based on unsound reasoning since we can only make the best informed judgment on the basis of the evidence given. In this way, there could be evidence that can appear in the future that would demonstrate that our judgment was incorrect. After discussing these problems Plato offers his solution through the theory of Ideas. He uses the example of the craftsman in order to explain that when words are created they reflect the same Ideas. A variance can occur when words do not adhere to the Idea and, if this happens, then a philosopher can assist in correct use of rational deduction. Plato then resolves the

difference between Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views by combining the elements of uniqueness and the need for an original structure for meaning. Variance and unique qualities are maintained since all languages reflect the same origin. This origin for meaning is not flawed since it is metaphysical, providing an absolute and pure basis.

In this chapter I will discuss Deleuze's reversal of Plato's philosophy of language in his reading of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*. Comparable to Plato, Deleuze seeks to combine empiricist and rationalist positions. In philosophical terms, this is to unite pure difference with structure. However, in contrast to Plato, Deleuze does not seek to create a transcendent foundation for meaning. Instead Deleuze seeks to affirm the immanent process and forces that affects language. He therefore aims then to reverse the traditional model by demonstrating how immanent forces always affect a transcendent foundation. I firstly analyse the paradoxes of indefinite proliferation, dry reiteration and neutrality in the series on sense in the *Logic of Sense*. These paradoxes enable a connection to be made to Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views and also Plato's solution.

After this, I develop Alice's apprenticeship through Deleuze's reading of Lewis Carroll. This demonstrates the evolution of concept of apprenticeship from *Proust and Signs*. In this way, the concept of apprenticeship remains relevant to Deleuze's philosophy even though the term itself appears to disappear after *Proust*. Alice's apprenticeship takes place through three stages, the identification of blank words, challenging predispositions through other possible meaning and the rediscovery of meaning through an ideal game. From this we can see that the *Logic of Sense*

combines the use of Locke and Leibnizian apprenticeship. Yet what separates Alice's apprenticeship from the Leibnizian apprenticeship is the rediscovery of meaning. In other words, it is not simply the purpose to discover other possible perspectives but to arrive at our own understanding. The chapter concludes by returning to Deleuze's relation to Plato. I argue that Deleuze paradoxically affirms both Hermogenes' and Cratylus' positions, without attempting to resolve them. By not seeking to resolve the paradox allows for an apprenticeship to not be always determined by an absolute structure that would guide their understanding. Crucially, in contrast to a Platonic position, structure, values and meaning are not destroyed altogether but retained. Paradox is a positive process for our understanding. This is because structure guides our understanding but at the same time it is transformed through the process of making sense.

Deleuze meets Hermogenes and Cratylus: the paradoxes of indefinite proliferation and dry reiteration

Despite discussing the *Cratylus*, Deleuze does not explicitly discuss Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views. However, we can relate Deleuze's discussion of the paradox of indefinite proliferation and dry reiteration in the fifth series on Sense in the *Logic of Sense* to illustrate the deeper problems within Hermogenes' and Cratylus' positions. The paradox of neutrality also illuminates problems within Plato's solution. The paradox of indefinite proliferation is to the need to continually define the meaning of one word with the name of another [n1, n2, n3 …] For instance, if I asked what is a dog? We do not arrive at a precise definition of a dog, but rather, a collection of names (four legged, hairy, mammal) that also need to be defined (what is four-leggedness? Hairiness? Mammals?). In attempting to arrive at a clear and certain

definition then we arrive at a multiplicity of possible definitions: "… I can always take the sense of what I say as the object of another proposition whose sense, in turn, I cannot state. I thus enter into the infinite regress of that which is presupposed."[3] The same problem can be applied to Hermogenes' view. This is because in order to explain a private use of language we would have to explain what the specific word meant. Even if we used a succession of nonsensical terms it would lead into infinity.

This paradox can also related to the *Meno* where Socrates attempts to arrive a definition of virtue. Meno initially gives a definition of the virtues between men and women: "… a man's virtue consists of being able to manage public affairs and in so doing to benefit his friends and harm his enemies and to be careful that no harm comes to himself … [a woman's virtue is that] she must manage the home well, preserve its possessions, and be submissive to her husband."[4] However the list provides to be endless since there is a multiplicity of virtues: "… there are very many other virtues, so that one is not at a loss to say what virtue is. There is virtue for every action and every age, for every task of ours and every one of us—and, Socrates, the same is true for wickedness."[5] Socrates' reply then attempts to make Meno identify general qualities that each of these virtues have in common through the example of bees: "If I were asking you what is the nature of bees, and you said that they are many and of all kinds … what is this very thing, Meno in which they are all the same and do not differ from one another."[6] We can then apply this technique of identifying the general qualities from bees to virtue itself: "The same is true in the

[3] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.35
[4] Meno 72a in Plato, *Plato Complete Works*, ed. by John M. Cooper and D.S. Hutchinson, trans. by G.D.C. Reeve (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997)
[5] Ibid
[6] Ibid, 72b-c

case of virtues. Even if they are many and various, all of them have one and the same form which makes them virtues, and it is right to look to this when one is asked to make clear what virtue is."[7]

The paradox of indefinite proliferation is apparent within my definition of sense as a process of understanding. This is because it appears that we never get to what we truly mean. Or to put it another way, we always remain stuck within a process of learning without knowledge. In philosophical terms, our understanding remains in a continual state of becoming that viciously negates the emergence of any structure or meaning whatsoever. However, this would be to assume that we initially have an invalid or incorrect understanding of the world that can only be resolved through the establishment of a metaphysical foundation for meaning. In this way, our empirical understanding then would be intrinsically flawed that can only be resolved through a rationalist approach and reflection upon a transcendent signifier. Yet we must not view the generation of a multiplicity of senses as negative or intrinsically flawed, as James Williams argues "this generation of new senses should not be seen as intrinsically negative, since the values come from the generated sense and are both negative and positive."[8] To have a multiplicity of understanding is then not meaningless or a distortion of knowledge but a production of senses. This is where in generating a new sense there is a revaluation of a prior value: "the infinite chains are not series of qualified and qualifier propositions, but rather, for the later propositions to refer to the sense of earlier ones, they have to take names from them

[7] Ibid, 72c
[8] James Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Logic of Sense: A Critical Introduction and Guide* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008) p.54

and give different ones for their sense. *You said 'bed', but you meant 'red'*."[9] What appears then to be a negative paradox where we cannot arrive at a clear definition or pure meaning is a positive since it emphasizes the revaluation of knowledge: "What can seem like a negative paradox ... [is] also a productive one because sense proliferates indefinitely 'We have more sense than we think.'"[10] The proliferation of sense then is a productive force that continually resists any final word upon a matter. To do so would deny the process of education itself where we would forever learn the same ways to understand the world. This would then deny any new developments in knowledge or to transform prior structures in order to make them respond to contemporary problems (Keynesian economics is the only way).

The answer to the paradox of indefinite proliferation is then to completely determine sense: "there is indeed a way of avoiding this infinite regress. It is to fix the proposition, to immobilize it, just long enough to extract from it its sense."[11] This is so that there is never production of a multiplicity of senses, but rather, the preference of one specific view over many. We then arrive at another paradox, of dry reiteration. This is because we continually deny any new understanding by always returning to the same original foundation. The paradox of dry reiteration can be applied to Cratylus' view. In Cratylus' view meaning is determined by its etymological origin. In this way, there can never be any new or different senses since the original meaning that was traced through historical analysed would always be privileged.

We can also relate the paradox of dry reiteration to the *Meno*. In remaining

[9] Ibid
[10] Ibid
[11] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.38

unsatisfied with the Meno's definition of virtue, Socrates asks him to define it again: "Come now, you too try to fulfill your promise to me and tell me the nature of virtue as a whole and stop making many out of one, as jokers say whenever someone breaks something; but allow virtue to remain whole and sound, and tell me what it is."[12] Meno replies with a more refined definition: "… virtue is, as the poet says, 'to find joy in beautiful things and have power.' So I say that virtue is to desire beautiful things and have the power to acquire them."[13] Meno's more refined definition then is 'dry' since it has removed a multiplicity of virtues to be based solely upon the poetic ideal. Socrates then illuminates a moral problem with this poetic definition of virtue: "… virtue according to your argument, the power of securing good things … And by good things you mean, for example, health and wealth? Yes [Meno replies], and also to acquire gold and silver, also honors and offices in the city. "[14]

This is because the individuals in the state who have the power to acquire beautiful things are the aristocracy. Meno has then given a more refined definition of virtue based upon his own aristocratic background. However, for Socrates and Plato, we must move away from our own selfish desire of what we find beautiful and pleasurable towards a universal idea of goodness that is attainable by everyone through rational deduction. Therefore, as we have seen, the foundation for meaning that is claimed by etymology then is not truly original. For Plato, the true foundation for meaning, as with the foundation for moral judgment, must be metaphysical: "when I begged you to tell me about virtue as a whole, you are far from telling me what it is. Rather, you say that every action is virtue if it is performed with a part of

[12] Meno, 77b
[13] Ibid
[14] Ibid, 78c

virtue, as if you had said what virtue is as a whole, so I would already know that, even if you fragment it into parts."[15]

This paradox was also apparent in Chapter 3's discussion of linguistics of Descartes and Chomsky. This is because of the privileging grammatical structure over phonetics. In doing so, there is complete denial of novel forms of language. As illustrated by Deleuze and Guattari, the danger with this view is that we arrive at institutional racism. This can be seen in Tarni Prasad's denial of the use of slang: " slang is language of highly colloquial type used by the people who are not educated and who do not belong to the cultural society."[16] This then to deny the youth or children use of language in order to continually correct with the use of correct grammar, as Mary Bucholtz remarks "In most linguistic scholarship, slang is defined as a rapidly changing lexicon associated with casual social contexts and used primarily by youth ..."[17]

The rationalist approach that attempts to define the causal principle or origin with its identification leading to the paradox of dry iteration then appears to be the most negative paradox. There is an absolute denial of newness, emergence of novelty, and knowledge becomes a process of reiteration of the same ideal. However, as with the paradox of indefinite proliferation, it enables an engagement and challenge to the validity of its claim for an absolute truth. As Williams remarks "It can seem that this paradox is the most 'negative' one that Deleuze presents, but

[15] Ibid, 79c
[16] Tarni Prasad, *A Course in Linguistics* (New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India, 2008) p.164
[17] Mary Bucholtz, *White Kids: Language, Race and Styles of Youth Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) p.68

that's not the case since … [it] allows[s] for the power of the 'infinite' paradoxes to be re-launched."[18] By challenging the validity of its claim for absolute truth then reinvigorates the debate where other possible perspectives and sense are taken into account (*Godfather* isn't the best, what about *Goodfellas* or Brian De Palma's *Scarface*?). What initially appears to be impenetrable is then penetrated through the process of making sense and discovering other possible perspectives: "… we re-energise movement or 'impenetrability' in exactly the kind of way interminable scholastic debates can be helped by the impenetrability of an esoteric term or the way a detached esotericism can be released through its insertion in chains of clarifying commentary."[19]

The solution to the rationalist problem of a causal origin then is to discover a pure metaphysics. In other words, understanding must become completely neutral and unaffected by worldly forces or have the potential to make an error in our use of rational deduction: "if sense as the double of the proposition is indifferent to affirmation and negation, if it is no more passive than active, then no mode of the proposition is able to affect it."[20] We then arrive at the paradox of neutrality where a multiplicity of senses is determined by meaning (A, B, C all reflect X). This is to arrive at a tautological foundation for knowledge where regardless of the many different perspectives still reflect the same meaning. This paradox can be compared to Plato's position in both the *Cratylus* (various languages still use the same meaning) and the *Meno* (all examples of virtue reflect the Idea of virtue) where language and meaning must become metaphysical. By reflecting upon the Idea our sense and understanding then is determined. In philosophical terms, reflection upon the

[18] James Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Logic of Sense,* p.55
[19] Ibid, pp.55-6
[20] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.39

transcendent signifier determines the same basis for all individuals regardless of their social or cultural backgrounds or their time period. This then enables us to overcome errors made in our rational deduction or moral problems by reflecting upon the same universal principles.

Deleuze illuminates this point through the paradox of Nicolas d'Autrecourt: "Let us take first quality, affirmation and negation: 'God is' and 'God is not' must have the same sense, by virtue of the autonomy of sense in relation to the existence of the *denotatum*. This was, in fact, in the fourteenth century, the fantastic paradox of Nicolas d'Autrecourt."[21] That is to say, the proof for the existence or non-existence of God still maintains the fact that God itself is an entity. As Chistophe Grellard remarks "… Nicholas, analysing the conditions of possibility of the knowledge and acutely aware of the limits of knowledge, is led to defend a form of fallibilist foundationalism based on a theory of probable knowledge. Such a conception of knowledge emphasized degrees of epistemic justification and rejects the traditional picture of knowledge as based upon evidentness and truth."[22]

With the paradox of neutrality Deleuze is makes us aware of the importance of the rhetorical and emotional relation to language, rather than, a complete focus upon meaning. As Williams remarks "[Deleuze] is allowing that the relations of intensity between different senses associated with propositions can change; that is; their significance."[23] By taking into account the rhetorical differences we can then make sense of the various different intensities that occur within speech (I don't just

[21] Ibid
[22] Christophe Grellard 'Nicholas of Autrecourt's Skepticism: The Ambivalence of Medieval Epistemology' in *Rethinking the History of Skepticism: The Missing Medieval Background,* ed. by Henrick Lagerlund (Leiden, Holland: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010) pp.119-20
[23] James Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Logic of Sense*, p.56

really love cats, I *really* love cats). The importance of this is that it demonstrates our own personal sense, rather than, a neutral one that can be applied to everyone: "[Deleuze] is also stating that this significance and its changes are not secondary to and do not supervene on any of the other moments or modalities of the proposition."[24] Comparable to Nietzsche, what initially appears to be neutral or purely metaphysical is not independent or neutral but related the process of making sense. Paul Livingston remarks upon these deeper immanent relations: "Within the structure that is defined simply by its differential relations, the singularities (or sense-events) are those points that correspond to what seem to be solid elements."[25] The metaphysical structure then becomes actualised through worldly processes: "these events, or singularities, are thus ideal in that they correspond to the structure of language as a whole and define its action, but at the same time real in that they account for the actual processes of change and becoming that occur within the course of this action."[26]

The final paradox of the absurd will be discussed later in context to the problem of nonsense in Alice's apprenticeship. Put simply for the moment, nonsense or the lack of sense is challenged by Deleuze. This is because, as we have seen, sense is a productive process of our understanding. In this way, when faced with portmanteau words we attempt to make sense of them (does the combination snake and shark mean snark?) From this nonsense must be defined not a lack of meaning but as an attempt to reach understanding. This is what defines Lewis Carroll's

[24] Ibid
[25] Paul M. Livingston, *The Politics of Logic: Badiou, Wittgenstein and the Consequences of Formalism* (London: Routledge, 2012) p.101
[26] Ibid

procedure, making the process of sense evident and preventing its confusion with meaning.

Alice's apprenticeship: a return to making sense of the world

Alice's initial understanding of the world does not begin through the process of making sense. This is because her understanding has been predetermined by social and cultural norms. In this way, there is nothing to be made sense of since her understanding of the world conforms that what is expected. It is through her journey in wonderland that we must return to the initial process of making sense. As Deleuze states: "it is not … a question of the *adventures* of Alice, but of Alice's *adventure*: her climb to the surface, her disavowal of a false depth and her discovery that everything happens at the border."[27] Her journey in wonderland then should not be dismissed as a mere nonsense or absurdity that is overcome when she returns to the surface. The importance is the journey itself since where Alice has to challenge her predetermined meaning and arrive at an understanding for herself.

Lewis Carroll's use of esoteric words forces us to think about the relationship between words and their relationship to worldly objects. As Deleuze states:

> Carroll asks: how can names have a 'respondent'? What does it mean for something to respond to its name? And if things do not respond to their name, what is it that prevents them from losing it? What is it then that would remain, save arbitrariness of denotations to which nothing responds, and emptiness of

[27] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.12

indexicals or formal designators of 'that' type – both being stripped of sense?[28]

What Carroll's use of language makes us reflect upon is the blank word. It must be noted that that a blank word has meaning, defined according to a society and culture. Yet it lacks sense, the process of attaining an understanding for ourselves. Comparable to Locke, Carroll's use of language challenges a pure rationalist view of language. This also enables a Deleuzian criticism of Plato to be made. This is because the making sense is an empirical process. We must be able to associate experiential qualities to our ideas, without which, they remain blank.

What then the signified or socially and culturally predefined meaning lacks is the excess of different senses and a displacement from its normative background. As Deleuze states "what is lacking in the signified series is a supernumerary and non-situated given – an unknown, an occupant without a place, or something always displaced."[29] These are complementary functions that challenge our social and cultural predispositions by displacing them. This displacement is then to return to the initial process of making sense where it has yet to be defined. In this way, it occupies a pure space devoid of any worldliness. Deleuze illuminates this point through the example of Alice's adventure in the Sheep's shop: "It is the adventure in the Sheep's shop or the story that the esoteric word narrates."[30]

[28] Ibid, p.21
[29] Gilles Deleuze, *Logic of Sense,* trans. by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale, ed. by Constantin V. Boundas (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990) p.50
[30] Ibid

In looking around the Sheep's shop Alice attempts to find an object that she would like to buy. Yet the problem is that each time she attempts to look at an object it suddenly disappears: "The shop seemed to be full of all manner of curious things — but the oddest part of it all was that, whenever she looked hard at any shelf, to make out exactly what it had on it, that particular shelf was always quite, empty, though the others round it were crowded as full as they could hold …"[31] A thought then suddenly strikes her to attempt to prevent this from happening by following an object: 'And this one is the most provoking of all — but I'll tell you what —' she added, as a sudden thought struck her. 'I'll follow it up to the very top shelf of all. It'll puzzle it to go through the ceiling, I expect!' But even this plan failed: the 'thing' went through the ceiling as quietly as possible, as if it were quite used to it."[32] What is crucial here is that she expects how things should occur and a common reoccurrence in wonderland these expectations are shattered. As Laurence Talairach-Vielmas states "As Alice's sense of the real – and therefore of her own reality – is increasingly constructed in semiotic terms … Objects become clichés, visual signs which keep displacing meaning elsewhere, as when Alice … tries to stop commodities from shifting from one shelf to the next and changing shape in the Sheep's shop."[33] On a deeper philosophical level, Carroll demonstrates that worldly signs are blank if we take them at face value. There is no worldly structure to them, only an ideal one that drifts away. In this displacement of meaning there is a discovery of pure sense, as Deleuze remarks, "Alice discovers the complementarity of 'the empty shelf' and of the 'bright thing always in the next shelf above,' that is, of

[31] Lewis Carroll, *The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll* (London: Penguin, 1988) p.185
[32] Ibid, pp.185-6
[33] Laurence Talairach-Vielmas, *Moulding the Female Body in Victorian Fairy Tales and Sensation Novels* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing 2007) p.64

the place without an occupant and of the occupant without a place."[34] Alice discovers the relationship between a word without language (blank word) and that there is no relation of language to determinate the object.

The contesting of the meaning of general names can be seen through the continual loss of a proper name, as Deleuze states: "…the contesting of Alice's personal identity and the loss of her proper name. The loss of the proper name is the adventure repeated throughout all Alice's adventures."[35] We no longer are comforted by a worldly sign but brought into dissatisfaction. This is to call into question our sense of personal identity, as Talairach-Vielmas notes: "By dint of displacing objects into images, Alice eventually displaces her own self, becomes literally alienated …"[36] In philosophical terms, our dissatisfaction makes a sign blank that which was previously gave us meaning is no longer the case. This can be seen in Alice's dissatisfaction with the empty jar of orange marmalade: "she took down a jar from one of the shelves as she passed: it was labelled 'ORANGE MARMALADE' but to her great disappointment it was empty."[37] It is through the loss of meaning that we may attempt to return to good sense, a determine meaning or structure that provides a determinate meaning. Alice's return to good sense is when she forgets the name for antipodes, that are "regions on the opposite side of the globe"[38], by calling it 'antipathies': "'I wonder if I shall fall right through the earth! How funny it'll seem to come out among the people that walk with their heads downwards! The antipathies, I

[34] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, 2004, p.49
[35] Ibid, p.5
[36] Laurence Talairach-Vielmas, *Moulding the Female Body in Victorian Fairy Tales and Sensation Novels*, p.64
[37] Lewis Carroll, *The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll*, p.16
[38] Marian Makins, Margaret Martin, Pamela Brenridge et al, *Collins Minigem English Dictionary*, (London, Glasgow: Wm. Collins Sons & Co. Ltd, 1981) p.9

think-‘ (she was rather glad there was no one listening, this time, as it didn’t sound at all the right word).”[39]

She then seeks to know the correct answer: “-I shall have to ask them what the name of the country is, you know. Please, Ma’am is this New Zealand or Australia?”[40] Yet far from arriving at a certain answer Carroll is challenging the Platonic notion that a name can only have only one correct meaning. This is because meaning is dependent upon our perspective. From a European perspective antipodes includes New Zealand *and* Australia and not either New Zealand or Australia. Yet it is also true, depending on our location that Zealand is opposite to Australia or Australia is opposed to New Zealand. Or to use another example, if we asked the question ‘what is red?’ The answer is not absolute but dependent upon a multiplicity of different senses (X is a different shade of ruby from Y). Carroll’s affirmation of sense as having an effect on meaning can then be related to Hermogenes’ view in the previous chapter.

In Hermogenes’ view we must use a private use of language in order to affirm each individual’s unique understanding. As Ugo Zilioli comments Hermogenes’ position is related to the character of Humpty Dumpty in *Through the Looking Glass*: “we can label [Hermogenes] position the ‘Humpty Dumpty’ thesis, as it is normally called in contemporary debates of philosophy of language.”[41] In the famous passage Humpty Dumpty states that he solely determines the meaning of each word: “When *I* use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, “it means just what I

[39] Lewis Carroll, *The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll*, p.17
[40] Ibid
[41] Ugo Zilioli, *Protagoras and the challenge of relativism: Plato's subtlest enemy* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2007) p.55

choose it to mean — neither more nor less."[42] Alice questions this to state that it is better to demonstrate the multiplicity of senses that a word can take but Humpty Dumpty replies that meaning must take precedence: "The question is," said Alice, "whether you *can* make the words mean so many different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master — that's all."[43]

Nonsense and its relation to sense

The problem is that Hermogenes' and Humpty Dumpty's position is difficult to defend since it does not take into account the everyday use of language, as Zilioli remarks:

> … the Humpty Dumpty position is not very easy to defend, since very few arguments could be advanced for holding that the individual somehow privately decides the meaning of a word … [this is because if] a community that decides to name things according to the semantic 'rules and usage' that such a community has established, we cannot help but think of Wittgenstein's idea that the meaning of a word is its use in the (public) language.[44]

An individual cannot determine the meaning of a word since language must always be used in a public space, a social and cultural context. In this way, language is part of our everyday life and emerges from our everyday activities, David Blair further elaborates on Wittgenstein's view: "[For Wittgenstein] language is not so much a collection of 'meanings' but something that can be used to *do* things – it is an

[42] Lewis Carroll, *The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll*, p.196
[43] Ibid, p.196
[44] Ugo Zilioli, *Protagoras and the challenge of relativism: Plato's subtlest enemy*, pp.55-6

essential part of our everyday activities and practices."[45] Meaning then is not a subjective action but a collective one: "this makes meaning a largely collective notion: meaning *emerges* from the *use* of language in the conduct of day-to-day activities and practices."[46] The Wittgensteinian counterargument to Hermogenes' and Humpty Dumpty's views is therefore comparable to Plato's criticism. A private use of language makes it impossible for us to understand the idea that is being communicated. We must then adhere to the general names in order so that all ideas communicated can be understood.

However, if we include the process of sense then Hermogenes' and Humpty Dumpty's view is transformed. This is because it is not solely a matter of preference of private names or general names but rather the *expression* that affects our understanding of an idea. As Todd May states "… language and the world offer certain ways of being 'proposed.' A 'proposition,' which is what has a sense, is a way of their being proposed. It is both an effect of that circulation [between nonsense and the different languages of the world] and a proposal within language for the world."[47] For instance, when learning a foreign language we are presented with a nonsensical word that does not make sense to us. Depending upon how a word is proposed to us then effects how we understand it.

In this way, our ability to understand does not have any preference since it is a process. As Deleuze states "[Sense] is indifferent to all opposites. This is because all of these opposites are but modes of the proposition considered in its relations of

[45] David Blair, *Wittgenstein, Language and Information: 'Back to the Rough Ground!'* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006) p.8
[46] Ibid
[47] Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005) p.109

denotation and signification, and not the traits of the sense which it expresses."[48] If we attempted to define sense according to only operating according to either private terms or general names then it would not focus upon the expression itself. In philosophical terms, Deleuze enables us to understand how pure difference (singularity of our understanding) is not completely separated from structure or actuality. This is because in seeking to understand the world we must make sense of it and relate it to our immediate experiential understanding of the world. As May remarks "Sense is produced by nonsense … it is because there is nonsense, because something can bring together the series that is being (or the world) and the series that is language and circulate between and among them, that there can be sense."[49] Yet we must not confuse this relation by materialism or a causal explanation. This is because: "Sense is incorporeal; it is not inserted into the causal order of material things."[50] We cannot then force or determine a causal occurrence of sense like when: "the sound that is produced when a bat hits a ball"[51] In contrast to this, it is a process that works through the structure itself. This can be seen through the example of an optical illusion. In order to understanding the illusion our eyes must make sense of more than what is drawn or merely perceive: "Draw a certain pattern on paper and the eyes see something more than what is drawn. This doesn't just have to do with the lines on the paper, nor with the eyes, but with what happens between them, with what Deleuze might call a certain nonsense that circulates in their interaction."[52]

[48] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.41
[49] Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction*, p.108
[50] Ibid
[51] Ibid
[52] Ibid, pp.108-9

May's use of an optical illusion builds upon a remark that Deleuze makes with regards to the relationship between sense and meaning in Alice's adventures: "the reversals that constitute Alice's adventures … sensing … is always in both directions at the same time, so that for once she stays the same, through an optical illusion."[53] It is then illusory that our use of language always the same. This is because our understanding is in a state of continually making sense. Carroll challenges the empirical act of association to always assume a connection between a word and its meaning. We cannot always assume the same sense applies to other individuals. However, a different sense or understanding of the same words must be used when in engaging in conversation with others (I said X casually, they look at me as if I just gave them a cold cup of tea.) Following this, we can then relate further develop Carroll's position to the Leibniz concept of possible worlds in Chapter 4. This is because our use of language represents our understanding of the world. However, this remains only one possible way in which to view the world. This should not determine other perspectives, other possible ways to views the world. In order to begin to understand another individual we must become an apprentice to them, a discoverer of an unknown world. Through a process of learning the unknown world becomes discoverable over time allowing us to view a different landscape from our own.

We then arrive at a minor use of language, which works within a major language. Deleuze outlines this through a discussion of the roles of Czech, German and Yiddish in Kafka's style with Guattari in *Kafka: Towards A Minor Literature* (1975). As they state "The vernacular language for … Jews who have come from a

[53] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.4

rural milieu is Czech, but the Czech language tends to be forgotten and repressed; as for Yiddish, it is often disdained or viewed with suspicion – it *frightens*, as Kafka tells us."[54] The Czech Jewish population then used German as a vehicular language: "German is the vehicular language of the towns, a bureaucratic language of the state, a commercial language of exchange."[55] What is problematical is that a direct translation of Yiddish into German without destroying its original sense: "[Yiddish] is a language that is grafted onto Middle High German and that so reworks the German language from within that one cannot translate it into German without destroying it."[56] We are left to only understand Yiddish through an emotion connection that is made through the expression: "one can understand Yiddish only be 'feeling it' in the heart. In short, it is a language where minor utilizations will carry you away."[57] What makes Kafka unique is that he is one of the few Jewish writers to still speak Czech: "Kafka's own situation: he is one of the few Jewish writers in Prague to understand and speak Czech."[58]

The greatness of Kafka's style then is not to opt for a preference of Czech, German, or Hebrew but a combination of all these factors: "Kafka does not opt for a reterritorialization [of Hebrew and German] through the Czech language. Nor toward a hypercultural usage of German … nor toward an oral, popular Yiddish. Instead, using the path that Yiddish opens up to him, he takes it in such a way as to convert it into a unique and solitary form of writing."[59] It is through this combination of elements that Kafka's style is a minor use of language that transforms the possibilities of what

[54] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. by Dana Polan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1986) p.25
[55] Ibid
[56] Ibid
[57] Ibid
[58] Ibid
[59] Ibid

is possible within a major language: “What interests him … is the possibility of making of his own language – assuming that it is unique, that it is a major language or has been – a minor utilization. To be a sort of stranger *within* his own language …”[60]

Therefore for Deleuze sense is then neither a private use of language or a lack of understanding. It is a process that works with an engagement of worldly signs in order to understand them. In doing so, we arrive at our understanding of them. This is then to arrive at a minor use of language that works through the use of major language. Comparable to African American English that works through American English in Chapter 3 or Kafka’s use of Czech that combines German and Hebrew. Deleuze is then making aware us of that each individual develops a minor use of language through the process of making sense.

Is a blueprint for meaning required? The ideal game and rediscovering meaning

A critical question can be asked of Deleuze’s epistemology and philosophy of language so far, what is it to discover meaning? Or to put it another way, how does Alice rediscover her proper name that enables her to successfully return to the surface with an identity? (“‘Who am I, then? Tell me that first, and then, if I like being that person, I’ll come up: if not I’ll stay down here till I’m somebody else’ …”[61]) In comparison to Plato, a structure, model or ‘blueprint’ is required for us to gain knowledge. This is because they provide a guide for our understanding to ensure we arrive at a correct understanding of the world and avoid making errors. We are then

[60] Ibid, p.26
[61] Lewis Carroll, *The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll*, p.26

able to use this guide in order to teach, educate others and make sure they avoid any unnecessary harm unto themselves or others. However, in contrast to Plato, there is no absolute model or structure to take place above all overs. This is because there is a multiplicity of different techniques and styles within disciplines. For Deleuze, we should be affirmative of these different approaches. In this way, the variance of different approaches is not destructive of knowledge itself where we cannot arrive at clarity or meaning. Instead they provide alternative perspectives in which we can understand and analyse the world.

An apprenticeship or a process of learning should not be determined by any specific disciplinary approach since we can go down any avenue and discover a correct way to analyse the world. In Carroll this is illuminated through Alice's discussion with the Cheshire Cat. Alice seeks his advice in which is the best direction she should take. Alice then represents the journey of apprenticeship where she is unsure which path in life she should take. The Cheshire Cat answers with it does not matter which direct she takes as any place will reach somewhere: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?" "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to," said the Cat. "I don't much care where—," said Alice. "Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the Cat. "—so long as I get *somewhere*," Alice added as an explanation. "Oh, you're sure to do that," said the Cat, "if you only walk long enough."[62]

What is crucial then is that although we have a structure or model to guide us, it is left up to us to enact it and make sense of it. The structure by itself cannot

[62] Ibid, pp.64-5

enable us to attain knowledge. For instance, we must not only learn driving theory but we must also practically apply this knowledge in actually driving a car. This practical application of a structure is called by Deleuze an ideal game: "… [Carroll's rules] seem to have no precise rules, and they permit neither winner nor loser. We are not acquainted with such games which seem to contradict themselves."[63] In a traditional setting, rules provide a guideline in how to play a game, with an element of luck and chance in order to attain the goal of winning it and are usually played against other players or against an A.I. As Matthew Fuller and Olga Goriunova state: "A classical understanding of games, running through from Huizinga to contemporary studies of computer games entails that one enters the game willingly and the game comprises 'the magic circle'"[64]. The 'magic circle' is "a zone in which the norms of the outer world are suspended, in order to follow through the iterations of logic, skill and luck inherent to the game. Each game has its own economy of chance and an end point of triumph or loss and refers simply to the constrained range of activity within the circle, the iterations of cards, pieces or gameplay."[65]

Carroll's ideal games in Wonderland run counter to this, there is no definitive guideline with the rule set constantly changing, nor is it competitive but usually in cooperation with others (everyone moving places at the tea party or getting dry at the caucus race). What we are left with is making sense of how to play the game and the chance that our understanding that we arrive at is correct. Carroll then forces us to return back to the initial process of learning to understand the world, our stumbles, fumbles and stuttering. Those initial attempts where we tried to do something

[63] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.71
[64] Matthew Fuller and Olga Goriunova, 'Worse Luck' in *Revisiting Normativity with Deleuze*, ed. by Rosi Braidotti and Patricia Pisters (London: Bloomsbury, 2012) p.160
[65] Ibid

differently before being corrected. As Aden Evens, Mani Haghighi, Stacey Johnson, Karen Ocaña, and Gordon Thompson state "Thought [for Deleuze] is never a merely virtual [metaphysical] potency detached from its actualisation; rather, it is always an actualization of a virtuality; it is at once transcendent and immanent."[66] These ideal, metaphysical or virtual moments take place within the actual games. It must be noted that it does not have to be an abstract or nonsensical game that has to be played but rather a traditional one. As can be seen in Fuller and Goriunova's comments: "what is so fascinating in many games is the staging of their magic circle into an all-consuming mayhem of other forms of energy, such as the deep implication of violence within football, and in a game as serene and mad as chess, the multiple filiations of the cold war with world chess championships."[67]

On a deeper philosophical level, Deleuze is demonstrating the fragility of attained meaning. With the continual flux of the world *each association that we make is by chance*. Just as each time we play a game it is different, each time we arrive at meaning, it is novel. Deleuze illustrates this in the thirteenth series in *Logic of Sense* entitled 'the Schizophrenic and the Little Girl.' In this series, he analyses Antonin Artaud's translation of 'Jabberwocky'. Upon first appearance, Artaud's translation resembles nothing like Carroll's poem. The initial stanza reads "ratara ratara ratara atara tara rana"[68] In this way, Carroll's use of nonsense maintains its relation to understanding where we are able to make sense of the portmanteau words. However, for Artaud we must destroy this relation to sense in order to challenge the

[66] Aden Evens, Mani Haghighi, Stacey Johnson, Karen Ocaña and Gordon Thompson 'Another Always Thinks in Me' in *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* ed. by Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin Jon Heller (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998) p.278
[67] Matthew Fuller and Olga Goriunova, 'Worse Luck' in *Revisiting Normativity with Deleuze*, p.160
[68] Antonin Artaud, *Antonin Artaud: Selected Writings*, trans. by Straus Farrar (California: University of California Press, 1998) p.451

aristocratic nature of Carroll's use of language, as Deleuze states "To Artaud, Carroll's games seem puerile, his food too worldly, and even his fecality [his emphasis upon eating] hypocritical and too well-bred."[69] The nonsense of Carroll then is a fanciful game that does not really force us to think too hard about the many different combinations of words. What we are left with in Artaud's nonsense is a creative way in which a variety of tonal combinations can be used[70], rather than, in Carroll's case where the selection is limited. As Artaud remarks: "[the lines] can only be read rhythmically, in a tempo which the reader himself must find in order to understand and to think."[71]

Even when a portmanteau word appears it is not confined to a set of function of rules but is one of a selection of possible meanings. As Deleuze states: "As soon as the word appears … as a portmanteau word, its structure and the commentary attached to it persuade of us of the presence of something very different. Artaud's '*Ghore Uk'hatis'* are not equivalent to the lost pigs, to Carroll's 'mome raths,' …"[72] This is because of the many different ways in which the word could be understood: "[Artaud's portmanteau] enact a chain of associations between tonic and consonantal elements … according to a fluid and burning principle which aborbs and rebsorbs effectively the sense as soon as it is produced: *Uk'hatis* (or the lost pigs of

[69] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.97
[70] Deleuze also discusses this creative act of association in Louis Wolfson. In Wolfson's case, there is a linguistics student who has an extreme aversion to their mother tongue. The process of translation then opens up the dynamic for number of possible ways could take upon meaning: "[the student] ensures a resonance between the two series and a conversion from one to the other, as he translates English words into foreign words according to their phonetic elements (consonants being the most important)." Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.98 This extremely complex process is illustrated through the example of converting the word tree: "tree … is converted as a result of the R which recurs in the French word '*arbre*,' and again as a result of the T which recurs in the Hebrew term [ets]; and since the Russians say '*derevo*' for tree, one can equally well transform 'tree' into 'tere,' with T becoming D." Ibid
[71] Antonin Artaud, *Antonin Artaud: Selected Writings*, p.451
[72] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.102

the moon) is K'H (*cahot* = jolt), 'KT (nocturnal), and H'KT (Hecate)."[73] Therefore what remains important about Deleuze's analysis of Artaud's language is that it is not dismissed outright, the language of the schizophrenic is not to be overcome by general terms, but rather, it demonstrates how language functions within the process of making sense. As Edward Scheer states "Deleuze tries to explain how the mad text functions and attempts to reveal the inner logic of Artaud's madness in an engagement *with* rather than a rejection *of*, this kind of 'outsider' textuality"[74]

The ideal games then affirms a dynamic set of rules where each individual's use of language has to be analysed separately. This singular analysis of each individual's language can be compared to Wittgenstein's language games. Comparable to Carroll, we must not restrict language to a unitary set of rules or functions, as Wittgenstein explains "it is as if someone were to say, 'playing a game consists in moving objects about on a surface according to certain rules …' – and we replied: You seem to be thinking of board-games, but they are not all the games there are. You can rectify your explanation by expressly restricting it to those games."[75] This move away from an absolute basis of meaning towards the multiple functions of language demonstrates the transition from the *Tractatus* to the *Investigations*, as A. C. Grayling remarks "in the *Tractatus*: there the claim was that the meaning of a word is the object it denotes; here, in the *Investigations*, it is that the meaning of an expression is the use to which it can be put in one or another of the many and various language games constituting language."[76] A word's meaning is

[73] Ibid
[74] Edward Scheer, foreward to chapter 5 in *Antonin Artaud: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Edward Scheer (London: Routledge, 2004) p.27
[75] Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations, 4th edition, trans. by G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte (Oxford: Blackwells Publishing, 2009) p.6e
[76] A. C. Grayling, *Wittgenstein: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) pp.84-85

not solely based upon its denotation due to the different expressions that can be used. Depending upon how a word is used then defines various multiple functions.

We must then analyse language according to the various games through the intention of the speaker, as Alain de Botton notes: “If a parent says to a frightened child, don’t worry everything is going to be fine. They can’t know that it really will be fine. [A parent isn’t] playing the ‘rational prediction from available facts’ game. They are playing another game, the ‘words as an instrument of comfort and security’ game.”[77] For Wittgenstein problems then arise through communication since we do not understand the games that the other individual is playing. This is because our understanding and rules for language differs from another. For instance, in terms of relationships and a partner is angry with us and states “you never help me, you are so unreliable” we can interpret this as a stating the facts game, as Botton remarks “… one might respond by sighting facts about how actually you got the car insurance yesterday and you bought some vegetables at lunchtime too.”[78] The problem is that our partner is playing a different language game based upon help and reassurance: “in the language game [our partner is involved in] you never help means I want you to be nurturing.”[79]

Surprisingly, after calling Wittgenstein an assassination of philosophy in the Alphabet interview with Claire Parnet that I discussed in the introduction, Deleuze agrees with Wittgenstein’s use of language games: “Wittgenstein and his disciples

[77] Alain de Botton, Philosophy: Ludwig Wittgenstein, The School of Life, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pQ33gAyhg2c May 8th 2015 [date accessed 13th May 2015]
[78] Ibid
[79] Ibid

are right to define meaning by its use"[80] From this it is evident that Deleuze in the Alphabet interview critical of the *Tractatus* whilst he praises the move towards the multiple functions and uses of languages that occurs in the *Investigations*. This is the use of a language becomes more than representation of images (It was a sunny day whilst sitting on a park bench) towards the focus on the intention of the expression itself: "… [the] use [of language] is in the relation between representation and something extra-representative, a nonrepresented and merely expressed entity."[81] Representation then provides us with the body and outline of an image but it is the expression itself that brings it to life. Without the expression itself we are left with abstract and blank (or dead) images: "Representation envelops the event in another nature, it envelops it at its borders, it stretches until this point, and it brings about this lining or hem. This is the operation which defines living usage, to the extent that … when it does not reach this point, remains only a dead letter confronting what it represents, and stupid in its representativeness."[82]

Anti-Oedipus, schizoanalysis and the affirmation of language games

Deleuze's later work with Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus* draws upon the influence of ideal games and dynamic rules for language in their novel approach to psychoanalysis, which they call schizoanalysis. This is to develop a novel form of therapy that challenges the Freudian role of the unconscious. For Freud, the unconscious is the repression of the memory of a traumatic event that has occurred in our life. This leads to a negative manifestation through our conscious actions. It is because the

[80] Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, p.165
[81] Ibid
[82] Ibid, pp.165-6

event was so traumatic that we forget it and forget the reasons why it happened to us: “When we try to do it in ourselves, we become aware of a distinct feeling of *repulsion* which must be overcome, and when we produce it in a patient we get the most unquestionable signs of what we call his *resistance* to it.”[83] The aim of therapy is to provide awareness to the patient of these reasons in order to be cured of the effects of trauma: “How are we to arrive at knowledge of the unconscious? It is of course only as something conscious that we know it, after it has undergone transformation or translation into something conscious. Psychoanalytic work shows us every day that translation of this kind is possible.”[84] In psychoanalytic terms, the therapist then makes the patient aware through forcing the memory from the unconscious, to the preconscious, to consciousness. Or in other words, the patient begins with a complete unawareness, then gradually becomes aware, and then finally arrives at complete awareness of the reasons for their behavior.

Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis does not seek to completely overturn Freud. On the contrary, they maintain Freud’s model of the unconscious but seek to revaluate its function and role, as Ian Buchanan notes “Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalytic revolution hinges on their renovation of the psychoanalytic concept of the unconscious … [they] preserve this basic model of the unconscious; they even keep to Freud’s tripartite way of thinking about it; but they change its internal dynamics.”[85] The best way of understanding their revaluation of the unconscious is through the contrasting approaches by Freud and Deleuze and Guattari in their

[83] Sigmund Freud, *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*, ed. and trans. by James Strachey (London: Penguin, 1991) p.54
[84] Ibid, p.167
[85] Ian Buchanan, *Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus: A Reader’s Guide* (London: Continuum, 2008) p.27

analysis of *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness* (1884-5) by Daniel Paul Schreber. In his memoirs Schreber notes the sudden desire to experience sexual intercourse as a woman: "I had a feeling which, thinking about it later when fully awake, struck me as highly peculiar. It was the idea that it really must be rather pleasant to be a woman succumbing to intercourse."[86] Schreber is then convinced throughout the remainder of his memoir that he is becoming a woman that is willed by God.

Freud interprets' Scheber's desire to become a woman as an expression of homosexual desire for his doctor, Flechsig:

> Schreber's mode of expression to enable us to divine the fact that the patient was in fear of sexual abuse at the hands of his doctor himself. The exciting cause of his illness, then, was an outburst of homosexual libido; the object of this libido was probably from the very first his doctor, Flechsig; and his struggles against the libidinal impulse produced the conflict which gave rise to the symptoms.[87]

He then traces the reasons for becoming woman to the original person(s) who are replaced figures of Flechsig and God: "If the persecutor Flechsig was originally a person whom Schreber loved, then God must also simply be the reappearance of some one else whom he loved, and probably some one of greater importance."[88] These original figures then "If we pursue this train of thought … we shall be driven to

[86] Daniel Paul Schreber, *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness*, ed. and trans. by Ida MacAlpine and Richard A. Hunter (New York: New York Review Books, 2000) p.46
[87] Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 12, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1953) p.43
[88] Ibid, p.50

the conclusion that this other person must have been his father; this makes it all the clearer that Flechsig must have stood for his brother…"[89] The cause for Scheber's becoming woman then is based upon a love for his brother and father with signs of initial sexual conflict with his brother/Flechsig that is resolved through its transference onto his father/God. As Freud states "The feminine phantasy, … thus had its root in a longing, intensified to an erotic pitch, for his father and brother. This feeling, so far as it referred to his brother, passed, by a process of transference, on to his doctor, Flechsig; and when it was carried back on to his father a settlement of the conflict was reached."[90] From this we arrive at the settlement of sexual conflict by resolution of the Oedipal complex, as Colin MacCabe states "The real moment of the Oedipus arrives, and with that visceral hatred of the father which psychoanalysis finds so fundamental, at the moment the child realizes that the father is himself subject to the law."[91]

Deleuze and Guattari note the problem of reducing the rich language and context in Schreber to the Oedipal themes: "Freud['s analysis] encounters the most formidable of questions: how does one dare reduce to the paternal theme a delirium so rich, so differentiated, so 'divine' as the Judge's – since the Judge in his memoirs makes only very brief references to his father."[92] In order to arrive at this as a causal reason for Schreber's illness Freud then disregards the various forces at work in Schreber's text: "… the enormous political, social, and historical content of

[89] Ibid
[90] Ibid
[91] Colin MacCabe, Introduction in Sigmund Freud, *The Schreber Case*, trans. by Andrew Webber (London: Penguin, 2002) p.xiv
[92] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Anti-Oedipus trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (London: Continuum, 2004) p.64

Schreber's delirium, *not one word is retained*, as though the libido did not bother itself with such things."[93] McCabe also notes that Freud's Oedipal resolution is problematical since it does not actually take place. This is because the father is transformed into an omnipotent image which affirms his transformation: "… paradoxically, one could say that Schreber never achieved that hatred of his father, for his father offered an image of omnipotence which allowed the child to imagine that he could avoid castration, that he could speak a language entirely under his control."[94]

For Deleuze and Guattari, an analysis of the political, social and historical forces allows us to understand why the delirium developed. In this way, *through an analysis of the language games of Schreber we move away from Freud's metapsychological cause to an organic explanation that affirms the text itself and the worldly processes that contribute to it*, as Buchanan notes "Freud maintains that there is a metapsychological cause to Schreber's illness (namely his homosexual feelings towards Dr. Flechsig) whereas Deleuze and Guattari insist that its cause is organic."[95] The patient then does not have an option to move from irrational to rational reflect, but rather, is developed as a response to the overproduction of certain intensities and images in their experiences: "Deleuze and Guattari very clearly take the view that the schizophrenic does not *decide* to see the world *that way*, nor can they *decide* not to see the world *that way*."[96] Comparable to Freud, Deleuze and Guattari take into consideration the role of Schreber's father but focus

[93] Ibid
[94] Colin MacCabe, Introduction in Sigmund Freud, *The Schreber Case*, p.xiv
[95] Ian Buchanan, *Anti-Oedipus: A Reader's Guide*, p.35
[96] Ibid

on the use of his machines that were used to correct children's behavior: "Schreber's father invented and fabricated astonishing little machines, sadistico-paranoiac machines – for example head straps with a metallic shank and leather bands, for restrictive use on children, for making them straighten up and behave."[97] These sadistic machines surprisingly: "play[ed] no role whatever in the Freudian analysis."[98]

Another part that played no role in Freud's analysis was Schreber's description of himself in the middle of historical conflicts: "In his intense metamorphoses and passages, Schreber becomes a pupil of the Jesuits, the burgomaster [mayor] of a city where the Germans are fighting against the Slavs, and a girl defending Alsace against the French. At last he crosses the Aryan gradient or threshold to become a Mongol prince."[99] These represent Schreber's conflict with his identity in order to revolutionize himself, or to become a Mongol prince: "Delirium has something like two poles, racist and racial, paranoiac-segregative and schizonomadic. And between the two, ever so many, uncertain shiftings where the unconscious itself oscillates between its reactionary charge and its revolutionary potential."[100]

Deleuze and Guattari argue that mimicking his father's machines, the need for Schreber to revolutionize or transform his self into becoming a woman is the need for him to produce. This is illustrated this through a point in Freud's own analysis: "Freud

[97] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, p.327
[98] Ibid
[99] Ibid, p.98
[100] Ibid, p.116

… stresses the crucial turning point that occurs in Schreber's illness when Schreber becomes reconciled to becoming-woman and embarks upon a process of self-cure that brings him back to the equation Nature = Production (the production of a new humanity)."[101] This allows us to make sense of the bizarre statements that he has a sunbeam in his ass. Our ass produces, just like the sun produces warmth: "Judge Schreber has sunbeams in his ass. *A solar anus*. And rest assured that it works: Judge Schreber feels something, produces something, and is capable of explaining the process theoretically. Something is produced: the effects of a machine, not mere metaphors"[102]. Therefore in Deleuze and Guattari's analysis we still maintain the importance of Schreber's father but by taking into account his background it is then evident that Schreber seeks to produce something that has value and worth. This is equated with the transformation of becoming a woman in order to produce things in order to have worth and value in society. Therefore, the role of the unconscious is not causal for Deleuze and Guattari but takes its place in a richer analysis of multiple senses, including the patient's many self-justifications.

Conclusion

Hermogenes' defence of an affirmation of a unique understanding for each individual can be identified in Alice's apprenticeship in *Logic of Sense*. This is because Alice is forced to confront and challenge preconditioned knowledge as gained from her social and cultural background. Through this confrontation these social and cultural meanings are shown to be blank. That is, the words lack any relation to Alice's experience or to her understanding of what is happening to her, so she must

[101] Ibid, p.18
[102] Ibid, pp.1-2

discover a new and unique meaning. This process of discovering meaning is not to completely disregard all prior structures of knowledge. Nor is this process to invent a totally new and novel form of communication. The process of discovery happens through being educated in accordance with structures of knowledge and general terms. We then arrive at Cratylus' view where the structure provides a basis for our understanding. What Deleuze makes us aware of is the importance of our practical application of this structure. It is through practical application that we arrive at greater understanding of structures for ourselves. Yet we also affirm the individual process of learning itself, based upon stumbling, making errors and overcoming problems.

In contrast to Plato, Deleuze does not attempt to resolve Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views since he demonstrates how both function together in a disjunctive synthesis. By combining their positions and still affirming their differences we can see the deeper philosophical implications of the empiricist and rationalist positions. For Deleuze, they work together paradoxically. On the one hand, there is the importance of our experience, and social and cultural background in forming an idea. On the other hand, we retain the importance of structures that enables us to teach and educate others. Comparable to Plato, a blueprint is therefore required for our understanding in order to gain knowledge of its structure. Yet it is through the process of learning and our practical application that a structure becomes dynamic and able to respond to contemporary problems.

This can be seen in Deleuze and Guattari's analysis of Schreber's illness. Although Freud's interpretation of the illness is problematized, it still retains value. They illustrate elements of Freud's interpretation focusing upon the social, historical

and cultural problems that contributed to the illness. In philosophical terms, by taking these immanent forces shown to be influential in the construction of Freud's transcendent signifier. In this way, our analysis must affirm novelty in order to account for the each individual's language games. This would take into consideration each individual's unique understanding and use of language. Or in other words, we take into consideration a possible world, a different way of viewing the world that must be explored and discovered than denied altogether.

Conclusion

What is it to know?

Traditionally philosophy has provided the answer to the profound question 'What is it to know?' by defining and communicating knowledge as meaning. Meaning is the end result of the attempt to communicate what we know. We are able to communicate our knowledge once we have attained an understanding of a meaning. In this thesis, the claim is that understanding is gained through a childlike interaction: the process of making sense of the world. This initial process of making sense of the world, as Hegel described it in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, is based on an affectual relationship with the world (the brightness of the sun, the roundness of a ball). The world in this state is a process of pure sense making. With no given structure, individuals are left to create their own structures and understanding based on how an object affects them.

It has been claimed here that at this point, of pure creativity and interaction, tension is created between sense and meaning. An individual's sense is at odds with general and factual understanding. In philosophical terms, this tension has been defined here as holding between singularity and generality. The tension is identified in language use through the correction of an improper use of a name. The private and singular use of language is negated or corrected by preference for a generally used term (that is not a nonsensical word jurblatt, it is a chair). A particular private use of language is novel but it is not knowledge. The private use of language is nonsensical as it lacks meaning and therefore in order for it to stand as knowledge

there must be conformity to generality. In order for meaning to be knowledge it must be communicated in a language that is understandable. This allows others to associate the same qualities and ideas to the same concepts. The process of attaining meaning can therefore be described as: making sense of signs (gaining an understanding), the attainment of understanding, formulation of meaning and the communication of meaning. A process of apprenticeship allows for an individual to gain correct understanding and to be able to clearly communicate knowledge. However, it has been shown here that philosophers disagree deeply on the nature of the process of apprenticeship. This thesis identifies two competing models of apprenticeship: rationalist and empiricist.

What is a rationalist apprenticeship?

The rationalist apprenticeship emerges by problematising our experiential knowledge. Our experiential knowledge is based upon opinion. It is from our singular opinions that we form a temporary understanding of the world. This is because our experiential world is in a state of continual transformation. For instance, each time we watch the same film or television program it is different due to varying circumstances that arise in each viewing. We can enjoy a particular viewing of a film but upon watching it at another time, there can be annoyances, such as an interruption by someone knocking at the door, the phone ringing, the neighbours' noise preventing us from concentrating, which make the experience unpleasant. In this way, opinion is temporary and affected by a set of circumstances outwith our immediate control. Due to this, perspectives can be transformed by different sets of circumstances such as viewing the film with or without constant interruptions.

Therefore, for rationalist philosophers, we cannot gain correct knowledge of the world based solely upon any opinions. In attempting to know a given thing we are always presented with a multiplicity of different opinions and perspectives.

For rationalist philosophers, the use of our reason allows us to arrive at clarity. This is because we are able to remove doubt about a multiplicity of possible meanings (X is A, B, C) and settle on one absolute definition (X is always A). This discovery of absolute definition follows from reflection on the inherent structure of given things. In philosophical terms, rational deduction allows an individual to move from an indeterminate foundation based upon subjective opinion to a determinate foundation based upon the structure of the object itself. For instance, in Descartes' 2nd Meditation the self is not defined according to body. Our bodies are based upon multiple meanings associated with organs, blood, flesh, and varying experiences over time. Through the use of rational deduction we are able to reflect upon the cogito, the pure and true idea of the self since it is not affected by anything sensually experienced. In not being able to be affected by external forces, rationalist concepts are transcendent and have a metaphysical foundation. A metaphysical foundation is necessary in order for meaning to always remain the same over time and be universally reflected upon by all. Through this reflection, regardless of social or cultural differences or time period, the same correct knowledge is always available to all. Therefore, in order to know, we move away from our worldly knowledge based a multiplicity of opinions to a metaphysical foundation that is universal and based upon a transcendent signifier.

An apprentice must therefore reflect upon a transcendent signifier in order to gain correct understanding. Using this methodology in an educational system, teachers would continually repeat the same values and methodologies. These methods would then be repeated by students in order for their knowledge to be correct. From this, we can see that communication plays a specific role, as a teacher always desires a particular answer associated to a particular question. When giving a different answer the student can then be corrected, allowing for an individual to reach general clarity. The aim of knowledge is not based upon the view of any one individual but is to arrive at the same idea apparent to everyone. This removes the potential for students to be manipulated into believing in false answers. It also removes the potential for an individual to be manipulated by another's opinion. This is because correct knowledge and true understanding is free from any prejudice or bias. In being free from prejudice an individual can move from having an incorrect understanding of the world, limited to their own culture, body and society, to one that is unbiased and universally true.

What is an empirical apprenticeship?

For empirical philosophers our knowledge is gained solely from experience. In his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* Locke's concept of sense presents a challenge to the role of transcendent signifiers within philosophy. This is because he claims that in the pure use of rational deduction we only reflect upon a blank sign. The transcendent sign is blank since it is devoid of all of experiential qualities that we can associate with it and thereby differentiate it from other things in the world. For instance, the transcendent sign of red is 'redness' but when this is devoid of all

experiential qualities of red we cannot differentiate its various shades such as maroon, ruby, crimson and so forth. For Locke, in order to gain an understanding we must make sense of a sign. Making sense of a sign is to affirm the relation of our sensual experience to our ideas. Our ideas are a collection of simple experiential qualities that are collected together to form a complex idea. An example to illustrate this is the idea of our bodies. A series of simple ideas, blood, bones, organs, flesh form our complex idea of a body. This associates a series of different experiential qualities to our idea of a body, whereas a rationalist negates the body itself in preference to its transcendent sign such as the universally accessible idea of the cogito that we can correctly communicate.

Our empirical ideas are based on inductive reasoning where we must base knowledge on most probable induction from varied impressions. For instance, in scientific experimentation, a collection of data is accumulated. In each instance, the set of data that is collected is different in each collection. From these sets of variable numbers an average or median number is generated. Yet this median number or average is a probabilistic reduction of the differences in the data. If the experiments continued, the median number could be altered and change the overall conclusion. This can be seen in the collection of data for calculating the average height of individuals, as Peter Feinsinger explains “If my question is simply ‘What’s the average height of people?’ all I can do is *estimate* that average height, basing my estimate on a much, much smaller random sample of people … the larger my sample, the better my estimate, although by chance that might not hold in every

case."[1] Increasing the number of people measured can collect a better sample; it is impossible to measure every individual. Due to this impossibility: "… no matter how large your sample, it's still just a sample from a much larger universe of possibilities. If you place absolute faith in the accuracy of your estimate, you always run the risk of being wrong."[2]

In relation to education, a multiplicity of perspectives is beneficial because it allows for different educational opportunities and also allows for the enrichment of knowledge. This is because an individual is not restricted to one specific discipline or methodology but has a choice of many different disciplines and methods. All methods, whether philosophical, artistic or scientific, and their attainment of truth is correct as they enable a different perspective of a truth. This transforms the rationalist understanding of a sign from being transcendent, pure and eternal to a sign that is immanent, fragmented, and timely. A sign is immanent as it is constructed from our experience. In this way, no sign can be devoid of any experiential qualities. Its fragmented nature should be comparable to an archaeological find. Each crack and piece representing a unique perspective once formed together, representing a multiplicity of perspectives. Therefore it is not the purpose of students to reflect upon the same inherent structure but to discover for themselves the way in which it could be different. In other words, this is to challenge the given structure of knowledge in order for an apprentice to reshape it. The process of reshaping a given structure is for individuals to attain their own understanding. However, this is not to destroy a value or method completely with the replacement of another. This is also not, in a Cartesian manner, to completely

[1] Peter Feinsinger, *Designing Field Studies for Biodiversity Conservation* (Washington DC: Island Press, 2001) p.177
[2] Ibid, p.178

destroy all values and methods altogether. In an empirical apprenticeship, to reshape a structure is to retain a given value or methodology.

Deleuze and the tree model for knowledge

The rationalist and empirical models for apprenticeship can be related to Deleuze's later description of a tree model for philosophy in *A Thousand Plateaus* with Felix Guattari. As Cliff Stagoll states "Deleuze's model of the tree-like structure appears to be quite simple. Typically, at its top, is some immutable concept given prominence either by transcendental theorising works on epistemology and ontology, he identifies Plato's Forms, the model … of the subject espoused by Rene Descartes … as well as the 'Absolute Spirit' of … Hegel."[3] With the establishment of the core concepts of a philosophical system: "all other concepts or particulars are organised vertically under this concept in a tree/trunk/root arrangement. The ordering is strictly hierarchical, from superior to subordinate, or transcendent to particular, such that the individual or particular element is conceived as less important, powerful, productive creative or interesting than the transcendent."[4] From this it is evident the aim of the tree model is to form the foundation (or 'roots') of philosophy. A foundation is necessary to establish a basis for our knowledge. This basis is therefore founded upon the creation of stability for our understanding. Stability for knowledge and understanding is achieved through the discovery of absolute truths or transcendent concepts. Transcendent concepts are absolute and pure as they are devoid of any experiential influence. Due to this, the validity of a transcendent concept cannot be called into question through either subjective bias or through social or cultural

[3] Cliff Stagoll, 'Arborescent Schema' in *The Deleuze Dictionary Revised Edition*, ed. Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010) p.14
[4] Ibid

differences. This is because all individuals regardless of their bias or their environmental background can universally reflect upon the same transcendent concepts.

The search for the discovery of transcendent concepts is evident in both rationalist and empirical apprenticeships. In the rationalist model, the discovery of transcendent concepts is seen to be necessary due to the unreliability of an empirical understanding of the world. A reason for this unreliability is because of the continual change of the world. This continual change then would mean that an individual has to always adapt their methodologies in order to understand the world. For instance, in discovering a new species of animal, there would have to be a complete revaluation of the species as a whole. As Richard A. Richards explains the problems of the classification of a new species "we can … identify what makes a new specimen a genuine instance of a new species, whether through genetic analysis, observation of interbreeding or some other criterion ... but if the differences in grouping are due to the use of conflicting species concepts, then it is hard to see how we can come to agree on species groupings …"[5] This inadequacy in defining species concepts can be demonstrated in: "… the biological species concept [that was explained] in our introductory biology classes, that species are groups of interbreeding or potentially interbreeding organisms. It takes only a moment to realize, however, that this concept applies only to sexually reproducing organisms and we would need at least one other species concept for the many asexual organisms."[6] This represents the greater problem in scientific analysis for Richards which is defined as: "… the species problem: there are multiple, conflicting species

[5] Richard A. Richards, *The Species Problem: A Philosophical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) p.4
[6] Ibid

concepts, without any obvious way of resolving the conflict. No single species concept seems adequate."[7]

In the empirical model, transcendent concepts are necessary in order for to make sense of the world. It is necessary to establish concepts that ground our understanding in order for us to reach comprehension of the world. This allows us to give order and structure to our sensory impressions. For instance, Locke's concepts of complex ideas or Hume's concept of association provides conceptual foundation for our understanding of the world. In Locke's use of complex ideas we are able to provide a framework for understanding a collection of simple qualities. Through Hume's concept of association we can understand how our social and cultural background enables us to have different ideas from other individuals with varied cultural and regional backgrounds. This allows a close connection to the rationalist model to be made because the characteristics of the mind that are discovered by empiricist philosophers apply universally. That is to say, even though empirical philosophers allow for our ideas to differ based upon our impressions and experience, our conceptual framework for understanding the world is the same. It is due to this universal conceptual framework that empirical concepts are transcendent and provide the roots or foundation for our knowledge.

A counter to this view of empiricism as establishing transcendent concepts could be that Hume's philosophy explicitly criticises any transcendent or causal origin. An individual need only look to Hume's infamous statement on burning metaphysical books: "If we take in our hand any volume; of divinity or school of

[7] Ibid, p.5

metaphysics … let us ask *Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number?* No. *Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matters of fact and existence?* No. Commit it then to the flames: for it contains nothing but sophistry and illusion."[8] This is true but Hume's criticisms form part of a paradoxical problem in his philosophy. The paradox being, how does an individual establish a value that allows for a process of transvaluation and thereby deny a transcendent foundation or origin for our thought? Or to put it another way, how can a value be established in such a way that it always remains challenged? By always being open to criticism it would then mean that the value remains in a state of immanence by always being affected by worldly forces. For instance, this problem was illustrated in the thesis' discussion of Kant's transcendental categories. Kant's categories attempted to completely resolve the problems that he illustrated between empiricist and rationalist position. In this way, knowledge, values, and concepts take upon a dogmatic approach by no longer being open to other opinions (of alternative categories or a different view of how it functions.)

Hume's paradox is evident in his short essay The Immortality of the Soul. In the final paragraph there is a comparable empiricist criticism against any form of metaphysics: "… If the question [of the soul's immortality] be out of the common experienced course of nature, this circumstance is almost if not altogether decisive. By what arguments or analogies can we prove any state of existence, which no one ever saw, and which no wise resembles any that ever was seen?"[9] However, despite Hume's humorous remark at an individual's inability to produce physical evidence for

[8] David Hume, *Enquiries Concerning Human Understanding And Concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. by L. A. Shelby-Biggie and revised by P.H. Nidditch, 3rd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975) p.165
[9] David Hume, Of the Immortality of the soul', in *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding: And Other Writings*, ed. Stephen Buckle (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007) p.196

an immaterial object, there is a paradox in his call for: “Some new species of logic is requisite for that purpose; and some new faculties of the mind, which may enable us to comprehend that logic.”[10] Hume is here challenging the philosophies of logic and the mind, which are traditionally based on abstract truths such as mathematical proofs or the innate concepts of the mind. For instance, this can be identified in the Cartesian cogito’s separation from the body or the mathematical proof’s detachment from everyday objects. However, Hume’s statement also challenges the establishment of meaning in empiricism. This is because in identifying empirical characteristics of the mind, complex ideas or association, there is a detachment from what we can experience to a concept of the mind. The empirical characteristics of the mind remains detached from the world as it gives structure and a framework to understand our experience. A paradox is then evident; our experiential world is in continual change and yet each time that structure is given that enables us to understand it, we remain detached from our experience, our bodies and the world.

A connection to this paradox is made in my thesis through Deleuze’s reflection on his education in the history of philosophy. In being educated in the history of philosophy a student learns a philosopher’s concepts. This enables a student to be able to communicate a given idea associated to a concept. For instance, the Cartesian cogito is a thinking thing. A student is then corrected in their idea if it does not adhere to expectation. From this we can identify both rationalist and empirical apprenticeships. A rationalist apprenticeship is evident, as a student must reflect upon the general signified in order for the concept to have meaning. An empirical apprenticeship is also evident as the communicated meaning adheres to

[10] Ibid, pp.196-7

the generally accepted view at a given time of a philosopher. Yet at the same time, the meaning that is reflected upon and communicated is blank. In other words, the sign and its attributed meaning does not truly make sense to the student. This is because they have not undertaken an apprenticeship in order for them to make sense of the sign.

This allows a connection of the empirical philosophy of Locke to be made to Deleuze. A connection can be made here as both affirm the necessity of the process of making sense before an object can be attributed with understanding and attain meaning[11]. The process of making sense then is an empirical act. This is because in making sense of a sign, an individual has to engage with a material object. Or associate particular experiential qualities together to make sense of immaterial objects (An agreed point in rationalist and empirical philosophy, as can be seen in Descartes' discussion of satyrs, the association of a goat's qualities with human ones, in the *Meditations*. Also in Hume's discussion of golden mountains, the combination of gold and mountain, in the *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.) In doing so, a sign is no longer blank but has worldly qualities that can be attributed to things from our experience. This allows us to understand why Deleuze argues in *Logic of Sense* that there cannot be nonsense or a complete lack of meaning as all things in the world are made sense of and seek to be understood through an affectual engagement with phenomena. For instance, in Hegelian philosophy, in the *Phenomenology*, we can see the process of making sense of the

[11] The necessity of making sense of a sign in order for it to have meaning is not solely a creation of Locke's but can traced to Socrates. This is because of Socrates' concern for other individual's education. This concern came from the problem of having a multiplicity of lecturers or rhetoricians who charged individuals money to listen to their talks on various subjects. In order to make sure individuals were spending their money wisely he asked what they had learnt at the lecture. In doing so, Socrates asks the individual or individuals in the dialogue to make sense of the lecture and arrive at a clear understanding for their self.

shapes, colours, and other qualities of material objects. They lack names and therefore meaning or knowledge, however, there is not a complete absence of understanding. This is because the particular object has qualities that can be associated to it such as its colour and shape.

The process of exposing transcendent signs, abstract ideas, as composed from worldly forces connects Deleuze to Nietzsche. Nietzsche's early essay *On the Origin of Language* (1869-70) analyses various philosophical claims for an original foundation for language by Rousseau, de Brosses, Lord Monboddo and Herder. In each case, the identification of the origin of language enables us to understand why we are able to communicate. However, on a deeper philosophical level, it establishes a foundation for meaning. This is because an origin establishes a causal foundation for meaning that explains how all languages can communicate the same Ideas. A project to establish an original foundation is therefore rational since it seeks to establish a transcendent sign that provides a structure and foundation for the formation of all languages. All individuals can then rationally reflect upon the same causal origin. However, the establishment of a causal origin for language leads to a problem that Nietzsche constructs throughout the brief essay, namely, the desire to attain meaning and its discovery lead to a detachment from our actual use of language. The idea of a foundation and origin leads to a negation of the tonal differences in expression.

For Nietzsche, rhetoric denies an origin to language, since what is communicated is not the truth but only a copy of it. This is because each individual has a unique sense of the truth. Our unique understanding is demonstrated through

the way in which we use specific tones and place tonal emphasis on certain words or phrases. An individual can then be influenced to make decisions based upon the association of the tonal emphasis. However, we continually revaluate our knowledge. We question its validity, diversify it through other perspectives, connection it to other fields, or discover new aspects to it. For instance, a sports fan and their knowledge of a particular team is dynamic. They continually revaluate particular team members and the overall performance of a team in each game played. Due to the process of continually revaluating our knowledge, individuals remain in a continual apprenticeship.

From tree models towards a rhizomic apprenticeship

In contrast to the tree model that attempts to discover and define the origins, causes or 'roots' of knowledge, Deleuze and Guattari offer an alternative model, the rhizome. They borrow the use of term from biology, as Felicity J. Colman states "… the biological term 'rhizome' describes a form of plant that can extend itself through its underground horizontal tuber-like root system and develop new plants."[12] For instance, potatoes form from rhizomes and not roots. As Hielke De Jong, Joseph B. Sieczka, Walter De Jong remark: "A potato plant consists of one or more stems that have grown from a seed tuber or seed piece. Tubers themselves are underground stems and are formed on stolons (rhizomes), not roots."[13] In Deleuze and Guattari's usage of the term, knowledge is a rhizome. In other words, knowledge is interconnected to the extent that it cannot be defined according to a hierarchical model: "unlike trees or their roots, the rhizome connects any point to any other point,

[12] Felicity J. Colman, 'Rhizome' in *The Deleuze Dictionary*, ed. by Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005) p.231
[13] Hielke De Jong, Joseph B. Sieczka, Walter De Jong, *The Complete Book of Potatoes: What Every Grower and Gardener Needs to Know* (Oregon: Timber Press, 2011) p.15

and its traits are not necessarily linked to traits of the same nature."[14] In a tree model, methods are related to their specific discipline.

For Deleuze and Guattari: "The rhizome is reducible neither to the One nor the multiple. It is not the One that becomes Two or even directly, three, four, five, etc. It is not a multiple derived from the One, or to which One is added (n+1)."[15] A rhizome is not to be reducible to an empirical model of general phases. It also should not be considered to be a rationalist model of an origin to which subsequent variations can be traced back. For instance, we should not consider the rhizome as reducible to general phases of technological change. Moving from the 8-bit *Nintendo Entertainment System* (1983), to 16-bit *Super Nintendo Entertainment System* (1990) and 3d graphics with the Nintendo 64 (1996). We should also not view each variation of the Mario Bros. games such as *Super Mario Bros*. (1985), *Super Mario Land* (1989) Super Mario 64 (1996) as a variation on the same mechanics and gameplay in *Donkey Kong* (1981). From this, we can see how Deleuze and Guattari's rhizome with their difficult and abstract explanation can simplified and relatable to everyday life. In doing so, this enables us to clearly understand its innovativeness.

For Deleuze and Guattari, an origin denies the unique and novel differences that are apparent in each variation in order to uphold the absolute structure. In relation to the Mario Bros. series, this would be to deny the various innovations in each game upon the basic platform principles of jumping in order to avoid dangers and reach the end goal. In *Donkey Kong*, the player has ladders and a hammer to

[14] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. by Brian Massumi (London: Continuum, 2004) p.23
[15] Ibid

assist them in reaching the goal. *Super Mario Bros.* lacks these aids; the player's goal no longer becomes a process of climbing and proceeding upwards but continuing forwards until it is reached. It also includes various different enemies that have a unique ability that the player must learn in order to know when best to move. This can be seen in the enemy known as the hammer bros who throw a series of hammers towards the player. *Super Mario Bros*. also includes power ups where Mario is given a unique ability that is signified through the change in his normal appearance. These include a mushroom that makes Mario slightly bigger, a flower that allows a fireball to be thrown or a star that turns him temporarily invincible.

In contrast to origins, a generalisation would allow for various differences in each game to be taken into account. However, this does not take into account the process of learning the new mechanics in each game. In making sense of how to correctly use a new mechanic there is a novel transformation of the overall structure of how to correctly play the game. For instance, *New Super Mario Bros. U* (2012) introduced the acorn power up that allows Mario to temporarily glide. A player has to learn how to correctly glide in order to avoid accidently hitting enemies and use it to reach otherwise unattainable items or levels. From this, we can see that a generalisation does not take into account the novel process of making sense. This is where a level is repeated and played differently according to how we were able to use the ability. This process of making sense does not mean that we should only privilege our successful use of the ability or completion of a level, rather, it allows us to identify that each play through is novel and different.

The tree model reduction of knowledge to origins and causes does not take into account the way in which our understanding bifurcates in several directions, crossing boundaries, disciplines, and perspectives. For instance, if we ask the simple question what is a fox? We are presented with a rhizome. Or in other words, what appeared to be an easy question with a straightforward answer becomes problematical because of the multiplicity of answers that can be given. This is because depending upon which discipline is chosen a different answer will be given. A scientific answer would provide us with the information that they are mammals, belonging to the biological genera the Canidae, the recognisable red fox belonging to its subgroup of Vulpes. An answer from literature is the tale of *Fantastic Mr Fox* (1970) by Roald Dahl who must steal chickens and outwits the farmers in order to feed his family. Or from art, there is Franz Marc's The Fox (1913) and, in music, Jimi Hendrix's Foxy Lady (1967) and Ylvis' The Fox (What Does The Fox Say) (2013).

The same problem of multiplicity is also evident if we try to find a particular answer within a discipline. In terms of biography, if we asked a question of who is John Lennon? We are faced with various historical accounts of his life. Philip Norman's *John Lennon: The Life* (2009), his first wife Cynthia Lennon's *John* (2006), Robert Rosen's *Nowhere Man: The Final Days of John Lennon* (2000), his sister Julia Baird's *Imagine This* (2007) or various celebrity accounts from Dennis Hopper and Mick Jagger to Yoko Ono's own account in her edited, *Memories of John Lennon* (2005). Or in terms of philosophical concepts, if we asked what is Nietzsche's concept of the eternal return? There is a multiplicity of answers and perspectives such as Deleuze's eternal return of difference in *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962), Heidegger's eternal return of the same in *Nietzsche: Volume IV,*

Nihilism (1961), or Karl Löwith's *Nietzsche's Philosophy of the Eternal Recurrence of the Same* (1978) who identifies the eternal return as the unifying principle for Nietzsche's philosophy.

As we have seen, a rationalist answer to the problem of multiplicity is to arrive at the transcendent signifier through rational deduction. However, an empirical reply is to note the importance of our experience, and social and cultural background in formation of an idea. Without our experience and background the idea remains blank. The empirical answer to the problem of multiplicity is through generalisation. For instance, we must use median number in order to calculate the frequency of an occurrence in an experiment. Without the use of a median we cannot arrive at an adequate conclusion since there would be a series of continual variables. The rationalist criticism is that the scientific data can always be called into question or doubted. In order to have a correct understanding of the world we must arrive at indubitable foundation. From this, we therefore arrive at choice of either a rationalist system that affirms an indubitable foundation/or an empirical system that allows a hypothesis to be continually called into question.

My thesis' reading of Plato's *Cratylus* problematizes the rationalist and empirical positions and their distinction. These positions can be identified through the conflict in the dialogue between the positions of Hermogenes and Cratylus. An empirical position is held by Hermogenes who argues that the emergence of foreign or minor languages can be explained through the use of proper names. This is because the use of proper names involves the communication of the specific understanding of an idea rather than a general one. Comparable to Locke's view in

the *Essay*, the adoption and popularisation of this usage then leads it to become a standard empirical use of language. Following this, we can see that eventually minor and foreign languages will emerge from the popularisation of using different terms to express an idea. In contrast, a rationalist position is held by Cratylus who argues for an etymological origin for language. From his perspective, there is a multiplicity of various meanings of words. In order to achieve a clear and certain understanding we must trace its origin. Comparable to Descartes' view in the *Discourse* and *Meditations*, it is through reflection upon this origin that we are able to attain clarity and able to achieve a correct understanding.

Plato problematizes Hermogenes' view through nonsense. That is, an individual's experience and the social and cultural background structures their use of language. If we attempted to use a different name for an object it would be in conflict with its general usage in society. In this way, the different use of language appears nonsensical since it is difficult for us to understand what idea is being communicated (what is a nagzat?) It also makes an individual appear to be idiotic as they attribute another name to an object that has already been predefined (a nagzat is actually a cat).

Plato problematizes Cratylus' view through the possibility of tracing to an incorrect origin. The act of tracing an origin is dependent upon the correct use of rational deduction. This is not to call into question the capabilities of an individual's use of reason, but rather, to demonstrate that our capacity to make a correct decision is limited to the information that is given. If a piece of information is forgotten or missing this could call into question the validity of the original judgment.

In order to explain this point Plato discusses the etymology of Sphinx. The tracing of the origin of the Sphinx relates it to the incorrect meaning of torture. The correct origin is the forgotten Boeotian form, 'Phix', which relates it to the mountain of Phikion in Boeotia. A modern example to illustrate Plato's example is an individual having been unjustly convicted. A wrong conviction is possible because new information and evidence may appear which calls into question the original verdict.

Alan Marzilli illuminates this point through questioning the validity of DNA evidence in the case of Josiah Sutton: "… Sutton and a friend were arrested after a women pointed them out to police as the two men who had raped her several days earlier. Sutton and his friend were shocked, and they proclaimed their innocence … Sutton's friend was released after a DNA test failed to match him to the crime scene."[16] However, Sutton's DNA test was reported by "… the Houston Police crime lab … that Sutton's DNA was consistent with the crime scene evidence, and that only one in 694,000 people had the matching characteristics. With those types of odds, a jury convicted Sutton and sentenced him to twenty-five years in prison."[17] It was later found out by "a pair of reporters, acting on tips from defense lawyers, had launched an investigation into the crime lab and had sent some of the lab's reports to independent experts. Those experts found serious flaws in the lab's work." Sutton's mother saw this story on the news and contacted the reporter's about her son's case. The case file was sent to William Thompson a prominent DNA expert who "… discovered that the crime lab had misinterpreted the results of the DNA tests, and that, in fact, Sutton's DNA was inconsistent with the DNA of either of the two rapists.

[16] Alan Marzilli, *DNA Evidence* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2005) p.18
[17] Ibid

After a new DNA test of crime scene evidence confirmed Thompson's conclusions, Sutton was finally freed from prison …"[18]

If we follow Hermogenes' and Cratylus' views we are faced with a problem of multiplicity. This is because of the multiplicity of meanings and possible origins for the same word. In order to arrive at multiplicity allied to certainty, Plato unifies the empiricist and rationalist positions. For Plato, all meanings regardless of whether they are proper names or general terms express the same Idea. In this way, the same Idea can be found and is communicated in foreign languages, our mother tongues, or minor languages. For instance, we are able to learn a foreign language because we can associate the same Idea in our native language to another language. This enables us to make sense to others when using a different language since they are able to recognise the same Idea.

The Idea therefore unifies all etymological origins and causes by providing a metaphysical structure for meaning. This is because same Idea can be reflected upon regardless of our social or cultural background or time period. In order to illustrate this point and contest the idea of different meanings, Plato uses an example of a craftsman. A craftsman uses the Idea as the structure or 'blueprint' to create things in the world. A good item that is produced will closely resemble the Idea such as a good car will closely resemble the same structure for all other cars. In this way, a good word will closely resemble the same meaning, which provides a structure for all variations of language.

[18] Ibid, p.19

Deleuze also problematizes the empirical and rationalist positions and their distinction. This is made in his engagement with Plato's *Cratylus* through a reading of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*. The various characters of Wonderland represent the empirical position of Hermogenes. Each character has a unique understanding of the world. Their unique perspective is represented by their minor use of language, either through the use of proper names or by having a different sense of a word. Due to this, Alice's ability to make sense and arrive at a determinate meaning is continually challenged. It is through Alice's attempt to understand Wonderland that the position of Cratylus can be identified. Comparable to Cratylus, Alice seeks to affirm a set of predefined set of worldly meanings as the foundation for meaning. These predefinitions allow for her to create a tension between the characters of Wonderland by confronting their unique perspectives and use of language.

In this way, Alice is not an apprentice but a master. She does not seek to understand but reaffirms a particular meaning. Yet each time she attempts to understand she is presented with a blank word. Or to put it another way, they do not make sense. This is not to say, there is no meaning whatsoever, but rather, meaning has to be discovered. The discovery of meaning is precisely when Alice is *forced to confront her adoption of general terms in order for her to make sense of them*. *It is through this confrontation that Alice must learn to become an apprentice in order to form an understanding for herself*. For instance, when she asks Humpty Dumpty the meaning of the Jabberwocky poem, he responds by giving her the meaning of the first few words. Brillig is four o' clock in the afternoon, the perfect time for broiling things for dinner. Humpty's answer enables us to begin to make sense of brillig. Yet

it remains only one possible meaning, could it not also be a portmanteau combination of the words amazing and brilliant? Alice then does not receive an answer that would always determine her understanding but rather leaves it open to different possible meanings.

It is through the process of making sense, engaging with a multiplicity of competing meanings and origins that we arrive at understanding. This is not to be understood in a Platonic sense: to demonstrate how all meanings and causes reflect the same structure. Deleuze reverses the Platonic model by affirming multiplicity. This is because all meanings are reflective of a process of apprenticeship. In other words, a multiplicity of meanings is reflected in each individual's understanding. In contrast to Plato, we are not led into a chaotic model where no meaning can be arrived at whatsoever, but rather, various uses of a given methodology. The attainment of understanding is for an individual to make sense of a structure through its practical application. It is through the practical application of a structure that we engage various problems. The resolution of these problems allows for the creation of a unique and singular perspective. In other words, the creation of an individual's own style. For instance, a film student will learn the general methodology of filmmaking. Yet in the practical application of the method they will face various challenges. It is through their novel resolution of these problems that enable their own style to emerge by their modification of the existing structure. Therefore after an understanding of a methodology has been attained we become 'structural engineers'. This is the process of transforming the structure in order for it to function in relation to a problem.

Deleuze and Guattari relate this process of the apprentice's transformation of structure to the modification of a map: "the rhizome pertains to a map that must be produced, constructed, a map that is always detachable, connectable, reversible, modifiable, and has multiple entry ways and exists and its own lines of flight."[19] Here they relate the structure of knowledge to cartography. This is because a given map may be drawn at a period in time but it will have to be changed over time. A modern example is the dissolution of Czechoslovakia in 1992, as William Mahoney remarks "After the June elections, Václav Klaus and Vladimír Mečiar are chosen as prime ministers of the Czech and Slovak republics, respectively. The negotiated 'Velvet Divorce' leads to the dissolution of Czechoslovakia and the creation of two independent republics, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, at the end of the year."[20]

For Deleuze and Guattari, a structure or map must be modified in order for it to have practical use. However, this does not mean that they completely disregard all ancient or non-modern structures. A structure of knowledge is not limited by its specific time period since we can still apply them to contemporary problems. Deleuze then does not seek a radical Cartesian approach, to continually destroy all forms of prior knowledge by continual reinvention of completely new methods; rather, he demonstrates how problems will enable an established method to be reinvigorated. We can therefore change our perspective on previous models and affirm those that may have been disregarded or forgotten. For instance, Deleuze's reading of the history of philosophy is reflective of this process. His reading of Leibniz and Spinoza challenges the traditionally held view of their philosophies as solely rationalist by revealing their dependence upon empirical elements. This can

[19] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, p.23
[20] William Mahoney, *The History of the Czech Republic and Slovakia* (California: Greenwood Publishing, 2011) p.xix

also be applied to his reading of Nietzsche and Hume where the empiricist elements are challenged through the discovery of a rationalist conceptual foundation. From this we do not have to accept an either/or choice of either rationalism or empiricism. There is another way which seeks out the paradoxical affirmation of both positions. By affirming both we maintain a rationalist foundation or methodology with an empirical system that calls this foundation continually into question. The process of criticising this foundation is not to devalue or destroy all methodologies or values but to revaluate them. Through revaluating a given value as methodology we affirm different possible views and different potential senses. At the same time, there is the continual use of a practical methodology and its values are also upheld.

A Rhizomic apprenticeship is therefore to discover new possibilities thanks to the empirical use of a structure. At the same time, general methodology and rational aspects of structure are upheld because they serve as conditions for this empirical use. Newness is not to be considered in its Hegelian sense as a synthesis. This is because there novelty and difference are negated in a generality. Newness is to be considered as a radical Leibnizian singularity. Deleuze affirms the radical singularity of each individual's understanding where no one shares the same sense. This also affirms the process of a continual apprenticeship, with a perspective in state of continual flux and transformation of prior understanding. The transforming of our understanding does not eradicate a value or prior methodology altogether. A rhizomic apprenticeship paradoxically maintains our unique perspective through the use of general names. For instance, our understanding of our pets such as cats and dogs are known by their appearance. This is maintained at the same time as we use the general terms of dog, cat and their names. In philosophical terms, our sense and

unique perspective is communicated precisely through the use of general names, in doing so, we retain the use of the name itself. From this we can see how Deleuze overcomes a Leibnizian problem for language. The inability to adequately describe singularity is solved through the affirmation of rhetorical differences that are present when individuals discuss the same values (It was clear from her volume and tone that she loved cats more than I did.)

Before I make my final summary of the points that have been made I will address a final criticism. A criticism can be made from a Deleuzian view that my description of a rhizomic apprenticeship appears to deny the creation of new concepts. This is because I have affirmed both the use of a methodology and its revaluation but not the creation of a completely new concept. In other words, it appears that a rhizomic apprenticeship is precisely against Deleuze's claim that the aim of philosophy is to create new concepts by affirming the same concepts in new ways. A problem with this criticism is that it does not take into account that the process of revaluation also allows for the creation of newness. This can be identified in the rhizomic apprenticeship when a student begins to develop his or her own style that differs from the standard method. It is also worth noting here that, for Deleuze, the creation of style is a novel accident that we are not immediately aware of. In this way, in the creation of concepts, a philosopher cannot be aware of all the contemporary problems that affect and are affected by their new concept. Nonetheless, their concept provides an answer to a particular contemporary problem. The creation of a concept is then a revaluation of given problems in the history of philosophy. This allows for the creation of new contemporary concepts that respond to the same problems. Therefore we can arrive at deeper philosophical

understanding between problems and the creation of concepts. Problems remain in a state of becoming throughout history. It is by engaging with them that we actualise them through a new concept. This enables connection to a conceptual history but, more importantly, the modernisation of that history. A rhizomic apprenticeship then allows for the creation of new concepts through a revaluation of a given problem.

To sum up, the thesis has demonstrated the following:

- Sense and meaning remain in a dialectical relationship
- In order to understand, we must make sense.
- The process of making sense is to associate various qualities from our experience, social and cultural background to ideas
- Meaning is attained once we are able to associate qualities together
- Philosophy traditionally places the role of meaning over sense in order to establish an absolute foundation for our knowledge.
- Education is based upon rediscovering the same truths.
- Language is based upon the communication of these truths. If differing from social acceptance then it is incorrect or if adhering to it, an understanding is correct.

- For Deleuze, sense takes precedence over meaning
- Sense is a continual process of understanding and revaluating meaning
- The attainment of meaning is novel and in a state of becoming
- Learning is achieved through the process of apprenticeship
- To be an apprentice is to learn how to decipher worldly signs

- Each attainment of understanding is always singular and unique
- Worldly forces affect understanding and language
- Language is based upon the paradox of expressing singular understanding through general terms.
- Singular understanding is maintained through the use of general terms through tonal expressions.

As for future research directions, the concept of sense and its relation to apprenticeship can be further developed with regards to Deleuze and Guattari's work on psychoanalysis in *Anti-Oedipus*. This is because the role of the signifier and its communication takes precedence in psychoanalysis. The analyst is able to diagnose a patient based upon their behavior and use of words. As with Michel Foucault's the *History of Madness* they are concerned with the harsh and tortuous punishments of a patient's non-adherence to the norm. In contrast to this, Deleuze and Guattari create the concept of schizoanalysis in order to challenge the role of the signifier and norm within psychoanalysis. Their alternative method is based upon a method that allows for a multiplicity of senses of a sign. The psychoanalyst must then transform his or her approach from identifying and seeking the communication of a signifier to allowing for a singular approach to be taken for each patient. This allows for a variety of causes and problems to be a potential reason for their behavior or illness rather than the same ones.

Given the diversity of Deleuze's work, other future research directions can seek to develop the relation of sense and apprenticeship in aesthetics and politics. In relation to aesthetics, the role of the film student and the film making process could be

developed using both *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* (1986) and *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (1989). Another aesthetic project can analyse the role of the artist within *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation* (1981). This develops the Lockean theme in of the artist making sense of the blank canvas. With the canvas representing various process and forces that affect their thought and also the creative task of challenging an image of thought. In relation to politics, Deleuze's work on Nietzsche and later work with Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987) add to the development of an immanent politics. This is to develop the role of the disjunctive synthesis within the thesis' chapters on Hegel and apply it to a political context. The idea behind this is two-fold: to address the problems of a dialectical and Hegelian-Marxist approach and to address the problems in the contemporary left. My future project then seeks to create an alternative process philosophy reading of Marx. I seek to offer a risk-based answer to the problem of the left that is influenced by Nietzsche, Deleuze and Guattari and David Harvey's reading of Marx.

I will end in the spirit of Roger Hargreaves, the next time someone says to you, do you understand? You will know what to respond, of course, I've made sense of it.

Bibliography

Articles

Hickin, Norman E., 'Woodworm and its control', *The New Scientist*, Vol. 4., No. 83, 19th June 1958

Newman, Saul, 'Empiricism Pluralism, and Politics in Deleuze and Stirner', *Idealistic Studies*, Vol. 33, Issue. 1, 2003

Putnam, Lillian R., Chomsky, Noam, 'An Interview with Noam Chomsky', *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Dec., 1994 - Jan., 1995)

Reynolds, Jack, 'Wounds and Scars: Deleuze on the Time and Ethics of the Event', *Deleuze Studies*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, December 2007

Stevenson, Richard J., Prescott, John, and Boakes, Robert A., 'Confusing Tastes and Smells: How Odours can Influence the Perception of Sweet and Sour Tastes', *Chemical Sciences*, Vol. 26, Issue 6, June, 1999

Williams, James, 'Why Deleuze Doesn't Blow the Actual on Virtual Priority. A Rejoinder to Jack Reynolds', *Deleuze Studies*, Vol. 2, Issue 1, June 2008

Books

Abrams, M. H. (ed.), *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* (New York, W. W. Norton, 1962)

Adamson, Heather, *The Civil Rights Movement: An Interactive History Adventure* (Minnesota: Capstone Press)

Ademollo, Francesco, *The Cratylus of Plato: A Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Adler, Hans, Koepke, Wulf (eds.) *A Companion to the works of Johann Gottfried Herder* (New York: Camden House, 2009)

Allison, David B., *Reading the New Nietzsche: The Birth of Tragedy, The Gay Science, Thus spoke Zarathustra, and On the Genealogy of Morals* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2001)

Annas, Julia, *Plato: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Ansell-Pearson, Keith, *Nietzsche Contra Rousseau: A Study of Nietzsche's Moral and Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Anttila, Raimo, *An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics* (New York: Macmillan, 1972)

Ariew, Roger, Green, Marjorie (eds.), *Descartes and His Contempories: Meditations, Objections and Replies* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1995)

Armstrong, Carol, *Cézanne in the Studio: Still Life in Watercolors* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2004)

Aron, Paul D., *Mysteries in History: From Prehistory to the Present* (California: Abc-Clio Inc., 2006)

Artaud, Antonin, *Antonin Artaud: Selected Writings*, trans. by Straus Farrar (California: University of California Press, 1998)

Arthur, Richard T.W., *Leibniz* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014)

Badiou, Alain, *Deleuze: The Clamor of Being* trans. by Louise Burchill (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000)

Baird, Julia, *Imagine This* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2007)

Balagopal, Jaya, *Discover Geography*: *Book 7* (New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan, 2006)

Barr, Alfred H., *Vincent Van Gogh*, (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1966)

Barthes, Roland, *Mythologies,* trans. Anne Lavers (New York: Noonday Press, 1991)

Baxter, Timothy M.S., *The Cratylus: Plato's Critique of Naming* (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1992)

Beistegui, Miguel de, *Proust as Philosopher: The Art of Metaphor* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013)

Bell, Jeffrey A., *Deleuze's Hume: Philosophy, Culture and the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009)

Bennett, Johnathan, *Kant's Dialectics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974)

Blair, David, *Wittgenstein, Language and Information: 'Back to the Rough Ground!'* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006)

Bowie, Andrew, *Introduction to German Philosophy: From Kant to Habermas* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003)

Brandhorst, Kurt, *Descartes' Meditations on First Philosophy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010)

Broughton, Janet, Carriero, John (eds.) *A Companion to Descartes* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011)

Brustein, William I., *Roots of Hate: Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Buchanan, Ian, *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: A Reader's Guide* (London: Continuum, 2008)

Bucholtz, Mary, *White Kids: Language, Race and Styles of Youth Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Burns, Robert, *The Collected Poems of Robert Burns* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1994)

Camus, Albert, *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*, trans. by Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage Books, 1956)

Carr, Karen Leslie, *The Banalization of Nihilism: Twentieth Century Responses to Nihilism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992)

Carroll, Lewis, *The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll* (London: Penguin, 1988)

Chappell, Vere (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Locke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Chomsky, Noam, *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought,* 3rd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

- *Syntactic Structures* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002)

Clarke, Desmond M., *Descartes' Theory of Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Clatterbaugh, Kenneth C., *The Causation Debate in Modern Philosophy*: *1637-1739* (London: Routledge, 1999)

Cloyd, E.L., *James Burnett Lord Monboddo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972)

Collins, John, *Chomsky: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Continuum, 2008)

Constâncio, João, Branco, Maria João Mayer (eds.), *As The Spider Spins: Essays on Nietzsche's Critique and Use of Language*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012)

- *Nietzsche on Instinct and Language* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011)

Cooper, John M., Hutchinson, D.S. (eds.) *Plato Complete Works* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997)

Cottingham, John (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Culler, Jonathan, *Barthes: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

Dahl, Roald, *Fantastic Mr. Fox* (London: Penguin, 2007)

Danto, Arthur C., *Nietzsche As Philosopher: Expanded Edition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013)

Dawkins, Richard, *The God Delusion* (New York: Mariner Books, 2008)

DeLanda, Manuel, *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2002)

Deleuze, Gilles, *Proust and Signs*, trans. by Richard Howard (London: Continuum, 2008)

-*Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson (London: Continuum, 2006)

- *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, trans. by Tom Conley (London: Continuum, 2006)

- *Difference and Repetition*, trans. by Paul Patton (London: Continuum, 2004)

- *Logic of Sense*, ed. by Constantin V. Boundas, trans. by Mark Lester and Charles Stivale (London: Continuum, 2004)

- *Desert Islands and Other Texts*, ed. by David Lapoujade, trans. by Michael Taormina (London: Semiotext(e), 2004)

- *Negotiations*, trans. by Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995)

- *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, trans. by Constantin V. Boundas (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991)

- *Logic of Sense,* ed. by Constantin V. Boundas, trans. by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990)

- and Guattari, Felix, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. by Brian Massumi (London: Continuum, 2004)

- *Anti-Oedipus*, trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (London: Continuum, 2004)

- *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. by Dana Polan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1986)

- *What is Philosophy?,* trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (London: Verso, 1994)

- and Parnet, Claire, *Dialogues* trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987)

Descartes, Rene, *Meditations, Objections and Replies*, ed. and trans. by Roger Ariew and Donald Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2006)

- *Meditations on First Philosophy* trans. by Donald A. Cress, 3rd Edition (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1993)

- *Philosophical Essays: Discourse on Method, Meditations and Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, trans. by Laurence J. Lafleur (New York: Macmillian Publishing, 1989)

- *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes* Vol. II, trans. by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoof and Dugald Murdoch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Descombes, Vincent, *Proust: Philosophy of the Novel*, trans. Catherine Chance Macksey (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992)

Dons, Ute, *Descriptive Adequacy of Early Modern English Grammars*, (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer, 2004)

Douglas, Fiona, *Scottish Newspapers, Language and Identity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009)

Dowden, Ken, *Zeus: Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006)

Feinsinger, Peter, *Designing Field Studies for Biodiversity Conservation* (Washington DC: Island Press, 2001)

Finkelman, Paul (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of African American History 1896 to present: from the Age of Segregation to the Twenty-first century*, Volume 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
Finn, Stephen J., *Thomas Hobbes and the Politics of Natural Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2006)

Freud, Sigmund, *The Schreber Case*, trans. by Andrew Webber (London: Penguin, 2002)

- *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*, ed. and trans. by James Strachey (London: Penguin, 1991)

- *The Standard Edition of The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 12, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1953)

Fuller, Matthew, Goriunova, Olga, 'Worse Luck' in *Revisiting Normativity with Deleuze*, ed. by Rosi Braidotti and Patricia Pisters (London: Bloomsbury, 2012)

Garber, Daniel, *Descartes Embodied: Reading Cartesian Philosophy Through Cartesian Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Gildea, Spike (ed.), *Reconstructing Grammar: Comparative linguistics and Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2000)

Glendinning, Simon, *Derrida: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011)

Gode, Alexander, Moran, John H. (ed. and trans.) *Two Essays On the Origin of Language; Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gottfried Herder* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966)

Grayling, A. C., *Wittgenstein: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Gregory, Andrew, *Plato's Philosophy of Science* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015)

Hadot, Pierre, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, trans. Michael Chase (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004)

Hallward, Peter, *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation* (London: Verso, 2006)

Harris, James A. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Harrison, Thomas, *American History through Music: Music of the 1980s* (California: Abc-Clio, 2011)

Hegel, Georg W. F., *Lectures on the History of Philosophy: Medieval and Modern Philosophy*, trans. by E.S Haldane and Frances H. Simson (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1995)

- *Phenomenology of Spirit* trans. A.V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977)

Heidegger, Martin, *Nietzsche: The Will to Power as Knowledge and as Metaphysics,* Vols. 3 and 4, ed. by David Farrell Krell (New York: Harper Collins, 1991)

Helterbran, Valeri R., *Why Flamingos Are Pink: … and 250 Other Things You Should Know* (Maryland: Taylor Trade Publishing, 2007)

Heraclitus, *Heraclitus: Fragments*, trans. by Brooks Haxton (London: Viking, 2001) Available at https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=bVxk39znNwIC&pg=PT96&dq=heraclitus+fragments&hl=en&sa=X&ei=KD0yVeiOOZbfau3ogFg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 18th April 2015]

Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Philosophical Writings* ed. and trans. by Michael N. Forster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Herf, Jeffery, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Ideology and Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006)

Hesiod, *Work and Days and Theogony* trans. by Stanley Lombardo (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993)

Hofstadter, Albert, Kuhns, Richard (eds.), *Philosophies of Art and Beauty: Selected Reading in Aesthetics from Plato to Heidegger* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964)

Houlgate, Stephen, *Hegel, Nietzsche and the Criticism of Metaphysics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Houlie Karen, Vernon, Jim (eds.) *Hegel and Deleuze: Together Again for the First Time*, (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2013)

Hudson, R. A., *Sociolinguistics*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Hume, David, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding: And Other Writings*, ed. Stephen Buckle (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007)

- *Enquiries Concerning Human Understanding And Concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. by L. A. Shelby-Biggie and revised by P.H. Nidditch, 3rd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)

Hyppolite, Jean, *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. by Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974)

Ingold, Tim (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture and Social Life* (London: Routledge, 1994)

Inwood, Michael J., *A Commentary on Hegel's Philosophy of Mind* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010)

Johnson, Jeffrey K., *American Advertising in Poland: A Study of Cultural Interactions Since 1990* (North Carolina: McFarland and Company Inc., 2009)

Jolley, Nicholas, *Leibniz* (London: Routledge, 2005)

- (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Jones, Charles (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Scots language* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997)

Jong, Hielke De, Sieczka, Joseph B., Jong, Walter De, *The Complete Book of Potatoes: What Every Grower and Gardener Needs to Know* (Oregon: Timber Press, 2011)

Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Guyer Paul, Wood, Allen W. (ed. and trans.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Kaufman, Eleanor, Heller, Kevin Jon (eds.), *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998)

Klein, Barbara Schave, *Not All Twins are Alike: Psychological Profiles of Twinship* (Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2003)

Klein, Wayne, *Nietzsche and the Promise of Philosophy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997)

Labov, William, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

- *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991)

- *Language in The Inner Cities: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972)

Lagerlund, Henrick (ed.), *Rethinking the History of Skepticism: The Missing Medieval Background* (Leiden, Holland: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010)

Lecercle, Jean-Jacques, *Deleuze and Language* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002)

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, *Leibniz: The Shorter Leibniz Texts*, trans. by Lloyd Strickland (London: Continuum, 2006)

- *Philosophical Texts*, ed. and trans. by R. S. Woolhouse and Richard Francks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

- *New Essays on Human Understanding*, ed. and trans. by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

- and Clarke, Samuel, *The Leibniz-Clarke Correspondence: Together with extracts from Newton's Principia and Optiks,* ed. by H. G. Alexander (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1956)

Lennon, Cynthia, *John* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2005)

Lewis, Gasper J., Vogt, Floyd, *Carpentry*, 3rd Edition (New York: Delmar, 2001)

Liberman, Anatoly, *Word Origins and How We Know Them: Etymology for Everyone* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Livingston, Paul M., *The Politics of Logic: Badiou, Wittgenstein and the Consequences of Formalism* (London: Routledge, 2012

Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. by Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)

Look, Brandon (ed.), *The Continuum Companion to Leibniz* (London: Continuum, 2011)

Löwith, Karl, *Nietzsche's Philosophy of the Eternal Recurrence of the Same*, trans. by J. Harvey Lomax (California: University of California Press, 1997)

MacClintock, Carol (ed. and trans.), *Readings in the History of Music in Performance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979)

Macintosh, Kerry Lynn, *Human Cloning: Four Fallacies and Their Legal Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Mahoney, William, *The History of the Czech Republic and Slovakia* (California: Greenwood Publishing, 2011)

Makins, Marian, Martin, Margaret, Brenridge, Pamela et al, *Collins Minigem English Dictionary*, (London, Glasgow: Wm. Collins Sons & Co. Ltd, 1981)

Man, Paul de, *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1979)

Marzilli, Alan, *DNA Evidence* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2005)

Mates, Benson, *The Philosophy of Leibniz: Metaphysics and Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)

May, Todd, *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005)

McDonnell, Niamh, Tuinen, Sjoerd van (eds.), *Deleuze and the Fold: A Critical Reader* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, *Consciousness and the Acquisition of Language*, trans. by Hugh J. Silverman (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1979)

Mertz, Donald W., *Moderate Realism and Its Logic (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)*

Meyers, Kari, Pacheco, Gilda, *The Perceptive Process: A Introductory Guide to Literary Criticism* (San Jose: Universidad de Costa Rica, 2010)

Miller, George David, *Negotiating Toward Truth: The Extinction of Teachers and Students* (Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998)

Monboddo, James Burnett, *Of the Origin and progress of language*, Vol.4 (Edinburgh: J. Balfour, 1787) http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=1pPMBJ6AopUC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 31st January 2012]

- *Of the Origin and progress of language*, Vol.1, 2nd Edition (Edinburgh: J. Balfour, 1774) p.12 http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=OctB-IVhyloC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [accessed 31st January 2012]

Mumford, Stephen, *Metaphysics: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Nadeau, Jean-Benoit, Barlow, Julie, *The Story of French* (London: Anova Books, 2008)

Nadler, Steven, *The Philosopher, the Priest, and the Painter: A Portrait of Descartes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013)

- *Arnauld and the Cartesian Philosophy of Ideas* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989)

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings* ed. by Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman, trans. by Judith Norman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

- *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* trans. by R. J. Hollingdale (London: Penguin, 2003)

- *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, ed. and trans. by Sander L. Gilman, Carole Blair and David J. Parent (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)

- *The Gay Science* trans. by Walter Kaufman (New York: Vintage Books, 1974)

- *The Will to Power*, ed. by Walter Kaufmann, trans. by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Vintage Books, 1968)

Norman, Philip, *John Lennon: The Life* (New York: Harper Collins, 2008)

Ono, Yoko (ed.), *Memories of John Lennon* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009)

Osborne, Catherine, *Presocratic Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) Available at https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=4QO_2YHyv4cC&printsec=frontcover&dq=very

+short+introduction+presocratics&hl=en&sa=X&ei=dekjVZO_NtCxae-MgNgF&ved=0CCEQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false [date accessed 7th April 2015]

Ott, Walter R., *Locke's Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Paffenroth, Kim, *Gospel of the Living Dead: George Romero's Visions of Hell on Earth* (Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006)

Parmenides, *The Fragments of Parmenides*, revised edition, original trans. by A. H Coxon, ed. and new trans. by Richard McKirahan (Las Vegas: Parmenides Publishing, 2009)

Parr, Adrian (ed.), *The Deleuze Dictionary* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005)

Paton, Herbert James, *Kant's Metaphysic of Experience*, Vol.1 (London: Routledge, 2002)

Plato, *Five Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo*, 2nd edition, trans. by G.M.A Grube (Indiana: Hackett, 2002)

- *Plato Complete Works*, ed. by John M. Cooper and D.S. Hutchinson (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997)

Popkin, Richard H. (ed.), *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999)

Porter, Roy, *The Enlightenment*, 2nd edition (New York: Palgrave, 2001)

Prasad, Tarni, *A Course in Linguistics* (New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India, 2008)

Proust, Marcel, *In Search of Lost Time: Swann's Way* trans. by C. K. Scott Moncrieff, trans. revision by. D. J. Enright (London, Vintage, 2005)

- *In Search of Lost Time: The Guermantes Way* trans. by C. K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin (London: Vintage, 2000)

Reill, Peter Hanns, Wilson, Ellen Judy, *Encyclopedia of the Enlightment*, Revised Edition (New York: Book Builders Inc., 2004)

Richards, Richard A., *The Species Problem: A Philosophical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Riley, Michael W., *Plato's Cratylus: Argument, Form and Structure* (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V., 2005)

Rockmore, Tom, *Art and Truth after Plato* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013)

Rodiguez- Pereyra, Gonzalo, *Leibniz's Principle of Identity of Indiscernibles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Rogers, G. A. J. (ed.) *Locke's Philosophy: Content and Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Rosen, Edwards, *Copernicus and his Successors* ed. by Erna Hilfstein (London: Hambledon Press, 1995)

Rosen, Robert, *Nowhere Man: The Final Days of John Lennon* (California, Quick American Archives, 2002)

Russell, Bertrand, *The History of Western Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2004)

- *The History of Western Philosophy* (Woking: Unwin Brothers Limited, 1947)

Rutherford, Donald, *Leibniz and the Rational Order of Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Sade, Marquis de, *The Misfortunes of Virtue and Other Early Tales*, trans. by David Coward (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Sauvagnargues, Anne, *Deleuze and Art* trans. by Samantha Bankston (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013)

- Deleuze: *L'empirisme transcendantal* (Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 2009)

Savile, Anthony, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Leibniz and the Monadology* (London: Routledge, 2000)

Schacht, Richard, *Making Sense of Nietzsche: Reflections Timely and Untimely*, (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1995)

Scheer, Edward (ed.) *Antonin Artaud: A Critical Reader* (London: Routledge, 2004)

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph, *Historical-Critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology* trans. by Mason Richey and Markus Zisselsberger (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007)

Schreber, Daniel Paul, *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness*, ed. and trans. by Ida MacAlpine and Richard A. Hunter (New York: New York Review Books, 2000)

Scruton, Roger, *Kant: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Segvic, Heda, *From Protagoras to Aristotle: Essays in Ancient Moral Philosophy*, ed. by Myles Burnyeat (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2009)

Smith, Daniel W., *Essays on Deleuze* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012)

- and Somers-Hall, Henry (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* ed. by Daniel W. Smith and Henry Somers-Hall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Smith, Olav Bryant, *Myths of the Self: Narrative Identity and Postmodern Metaphysics* (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2004)
Singer, Peter, *Hegel: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Solomon, Robert C., *In The Spirit of Hegel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)

Somers-Hall, Henry, *Deleuze's Difference and Repetition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013)

- *Hegel, Deleuze and the Critique of Representation: Dialectics of Negation and Difference* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2012)

Stagoll, Cliff, 'Arborescent Schema' in *The Deleuze Dictionary Revised Edition*, ed. Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010)

Stern, Robert, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hegel and the Phenomenology of Spirit* (London: Routledge, 2002)

Stirner, Max, *The Ego and Its Own*, ed. by David Leopold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Tabak, John, *Geometry: The Language of Space and Form* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2004)

Talairach-Vielmas, Laurence, *Moulding the Female Body in Victorian Fairy Tales and Sensation Novels* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing 2007)

Thomas, Brook, *The New Historicism: And Other Old-Fashioned Topics*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991)

Thomson, Thomas, Daniel K. Sandford and Allan Cunningham, *The Popular Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, (Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1841)

Traiger, Saul (ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006)

Verburg, Pieter Adrianus, *Language and its functions: a historico-critical study of views concerning the functions of language from the pre-humanistic philology of Orleans to the rationalistic philology of Bopp* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1998)

Vernon, Jim, *Hegel's Philosophy of Language* (London: Continuum, 2007)

Waicukauski, Ronald J., Sandler, Paul Mark, Epps, JoAnne, *The Winning Argument* (Illinois: American Bar Association Publishing, 2001)

Wartofsky, Marx W., *Feuerbach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

Welsh, John F., *Max Stirner's Dialectical Egoism: A New Interpretation* (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2010)

Williams, James, *Gilles Deleuze's Logic of Sense: A Critical Introduction and Guide* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008)

- Gilles Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition* : *A Critical Introduction and Guide* (Edinburgh: University Press, 2003)

Williams, Linda L., *Nietzsche's Mirror: The World as Will to Power* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001)

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D.F. Pears and B.F. Guinness (London: Routledge, 2005)

- *Philosophical Investigations*, 3rd edition, trans. by G. E. M. Anscombe (Blackwell Publishing, 2001)

Woolhouse (ed.), R. S., *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz: Metaphysics and its foundations* (London: Routledge, 1994)

Zhongshu, Qian, 'China in the English literature of the Eighteenth Century' in Adrian Hsia (ed.), *The Vision of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998)

Zilioli, Ugo, *Protagoras and the challenge of relativism: Plato's subtlest enemy* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2007)

Zizek, Slavoj, *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences* (London: Routledge, 2012)

- *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences* (London: Routledge, 2004)

Zuckert, Catherine H., *Postmodern Platos* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996)

Discography

Hendrix, Jimi, Foxy Lady, Producer Chas Chander, Reprise Records, 1967

Ylvisåker, Bård, Ylvisåker, Vegard, Løchstøer, Christian et al, Ylvis the Fox, Producers Stargate and M4SONIC, Concorde TV, Parlophone, EMI Norway, 2013

Filmography

Deleuze, Gilles *From A to Z*, trans. by Charles J. Stivale, dir. by Pierre-Andre Boutang (London: Semiotext(e), 2011)

Dr Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb, dir. Stanley Kubrick (Columbia Pictures, 1964)

Logan's Run, dir. Michael Anderson (Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1976)

Websites

Botton, Alain de, Philosophy: Ludwig Wittgenstein, The School of Life, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pQ33gAyhg2c May 8th 2015 [date accessed 13th May 2015]

Chomsky, Noam, 'Language and the Cognitive Science Revolution(s)' Carleton University, April 8th 2011 transcript by David P. Wilkins, http://www.chomsky.info/talks/20110408.htm [date accessed 12th August 2013]

Deleuze, Gilles, Leibniz course at Vincennes 29th April 1980, transcribed by Richard Pinhas http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=54&groupe=Leibniz&langue=1 [accessed 12th January 2015].

Deleuze, Gilles, Leibniz course at Vincennes 29th April 1980, English translation, http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=55&groupe=Leibniz&langue=2 [accessed 12th January 2015]

Heraclitus, *The Fragments of the Work of Heraclitus of Ephesus on Nature*, trans. by G.T.W. Patrick (Baltimore: N. Murray, 1889) Available at http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/heraclitus/herpate.htm [accessed 18th April 2015]

Rodiguez-Pereyra, Gonzalo, 'Nominalism in Metaphysics', 2015, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nominalism-metaphysics/ [accessed 16th February 2016]

Index